### Area Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UWT Center for Equity and Inclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target Enrollment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 1000 Unique Student Visitors per quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 July, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3250sf-3650sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Center Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Description</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lounge / &quot;Chill&quot; Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incubator Space w/ Work Stations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Meeting Room (12 people)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Meeting Room/Meditation Space (3 people)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Library</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom / Training Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Study Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal CEI Spaces: 8 spaces, 950sf

### Staff Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Description</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Manager Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Desks &amp; Drop-in Space</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Staff Desks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Admin / Staff: 8 spaces, 730sf

### Support Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Space Description</th>
<th>Teaching Stations</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check-in / Welcome area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break Room / Copy Room / Lockers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Support Spaces: 3 teaching stations, 270sf

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Stations</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Program Area</td>
<td>2,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation as a % of Net Program Area</td>
<td>15% 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls/Structure as a % of Net Program Area</td>
<td>10% 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Area</td>
<td>25% 3,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexee</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Wilson</td>
<td>UWT Lib</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dona Myhre</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Stevens</td>
<td>Fas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Hansen</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almen</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike farm</td>
<td>UWT CEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Pagano</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedra Mailo</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequoia cone</td>
<td>CEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saguinita P</td>
<td>CF1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick P</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danna Miller</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Clark</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonnie Becker</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Figurea</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annie</td>
<td>MCG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff</td>
<td>UWT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Contreras</td>
<td>UW-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Mentino</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie Peralta</td>
<td>ASUW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angie Zuache</td>
<td>UW-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed Mirecki</td>
<td>SAES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseann Martinez</td>
<td>Student Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Streubel</td>
<td>UW-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasri Isaac</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koros Toews</td>
<td>UW-T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ara Papyan</td>
<td>First Gen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEETING MINUTES
VMRC/VIBE Kick-off Meeting, November 7, 2018
Prepared by: Shona Bose
08 November 2018

Attendees:
- Elizabeth Hyun, Space Planning Manager (EH) CRPS
- Pat Clark, Director of Campus Planning (PC) CRPS
- Melony Pederson, Project Development & Cons’t Mgr (MP)
- Roz Johnson, Assoc Dir of Vet & Mil Svcs (RJ) VMS
- Mike Wark, Assist Vice Chancellor for External Relations, Office of Advancement (MW)
- Thomas Kuljam, Director of VIBE (TK) VIBE
- Matt Lane, Principal/PM (ML) mcg-ARC
- Shona Bose, Project Designer (SB) mcg-ARC
- Seong Shin, Interior Design Principal (SS) mcg-ARC
- Karl Smith, Assoc Vice Chancellor & Chief Admissions Officer, Enrollment Services (KS) ES
- Andrea Coker Anderson, Registrar/Vet Services, Office of the Registrar (ACA) OOR

ITEMS DISCUSSED
I. VMRC BACKSTORY
   A. The federal government mandates 8 keys of support for veterans on college campuses to receive the GI Bill
   B. One key component is to have a centralized area with veteran support and a lounge/chill-out space
   C. To fulfill this promise, UWT moved the Veterans Military Resource Center (VMRC) from the Mattress Factory to the west wing of the 3rd floor on Tioga Library Building (TLB)
   D. Co-located in this space is Veterans Military Services (VMS) and the Veterans Incubator for Better Entrepreneurship (VIBE).
   E. VMS largely provides support and resources, helping students access federal benefits and information.
   F. VIBE nurtures and supports veterans who want to become entrepreneurs. Vets are 45% more likely to be business owners than civilians.
   G. Both groups share the VMRC space utilizing common areas like the private study rooms, large open area, and lounge/soft-seating area.
   H. The move from the Mattress Factory provided more space and co-location but had some adverse results as well
      a. Being further away from UWT administrators resulted in a loss of that relationship as well as a difficult wayfinding mission for visiting/potential vet students to find all the resources they need.
      b. VMRC finds that potential students will often find the VMRC first and then are directed to admissions. Ideally, they are escorted to the Mattress Factory from TLB3, but that is not always feasible.

II. PROGRAMMING
   A. Existing space – what is working:
      a. The space flows in an orderly manner that works well. The very public, open VIBE space is at the entry and the programming becomes more and more private as you move through.
      b. There is a mix of civilian and military themed space, so there is space for vets identify strongly with their military service (leans more towards VMS), space for those who want to distance themselves from it (leans more towards VIBE), space for those who float in between who are learning to be civilians again.
c. Co-locating VMS and VIBE allows them to use the same open areas for conferences, meetings, and public events. This allows veterans visiting for services and resources to see and become engaged in the VIBE program and vice-versa.

d. Diagrams of existing co-located space:

![Current co-located space.](image1)

![Current fluidity between spaces.](image2)

![Adjacencies with other campus programs.](image3)

B. Existing space - not working:
   a. There no private offices for more sensitive/HR meetings and phone calls (which happen a lot for VMS who makes many phone calls to the VA.)
   b. Acoustics – both programs need a space that is better acoustically separated for their vets to be comfortable saying and processing what they need to.

C. Programming Spaces - VMS
   a. (3) Private offices with L-shaped desks and small conference table, acoustically separated
b. (3) Student Desks in one space, adjacent to private offices.
   i. (1) student front desk, staffed full time.
   ii. (1) PAVE/Work study student desk, staff full time.
   iii. (1) Part-time VetCorps Navigator desk.

D. Programming Spaces - VIBE
   a. Might not be a forever home to be co-located. VIBE could be located in the new Academic Innovation
      Building on Market Street to be built in 2023, but that might break the fluidity and serendipity for vets to
      find VIBE through visiting VMS and vice versa.
   b. (1) open office/desk area in the open area for VIBE director – great for upcoming entrepreneurs to listen in
      and see how he works. Also good to have proximity to the entrance to greet students.
   c. Incubation area – could be same as large, shared open area, but needs to have space for creativity &
      entrepreneurship to happen

E. Programming Spaces – Shared
   a. Large, open area for pizza parties, VIBE daily programming, conferences, student groups, study groups,
      after hours community partnerships.
      i. Moveable furniture, tables and chairs with wheels that stack for up to 30 people.
      ii. Tech like in TLB307 space: projector/screen or smart tv, audio/visual, recording ability, video
          casting.
      iii. Whiteboards – on walls and moveable.
      iv. Mix of civilian/military aesthetic.
   b. Lounge/Chill Space – soft seating furniture, tv w/ civilian aesthetic.
   c. Kitc nnette w/ water, fridge, coffee maker, counter space. Shared and open to students.
   d. (2) Student computer stations, semi-private.
   e. (2) Private break out areas for up to (4) people.
   f. Storage space for VMS and VIBE.
   g. Storage space accessible for student veteran clubs.

F. Alaska Air is the sponsor for the VMS space. There is some logo and branding to be aware of. MW to investigate if
   there are any other requirements of the sponsorship agreement.

III. NEXT STEPS
   A. McGranahan to study what we heard today and return with diagrams for future discussions.
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MEETING MINUTES
Event Space Kick-off Meeting, November 7, 2018
Prepared by: Shona Bose
08 November 2018

Attendees:
- Elizabeth Hyun, Space Planning Manager (EH) CRPS
- Pat Clark, Director of Campus Planning (PC) CRPS
- Melony Pederson, Project Development & Cons’t Mngr (MP) CRPS
- Lisa Reeves, Director Educational Outreach EO
- Chelsea Kastelnik, Conference Services Manager CS
- BrieAnna Bales, Director of Events, Office of Advancement OOA
- Mike Wark, AVC External Relations OOA
- Karl Smith, AVC Enrollment Services ES
- Roz Johnson, Assoc Dir Vet & Mil Svcs VMS

- Matt Lane, Principal/PM (ML) mcg-ARC
- Shona Bose, Project Designer (SB) mcg-ARC
- Seong Shin, Interior Design Principal (SS) mcg-ARC
- Henry Santos, BCE Engineers BCE
- Tessa Coleman, Facility Manager FS
- Stanley Joshua, Director of Facility Services FS
- Forrest Tyree, Assoc Dir of Information Tech IT
- John Stevens, Network Manager IT

ITEMS DISCUSSED

I. REPURPOSING THE SNO-POWERHOUSE READING ROOM

A. This meeting was to gather many university programs to discuss converting the Snoqualmie Powerhouse Reading Room space to an all university event space and what that would look like as the rest of SNO and Tioga Library Building shift as well.

B. This space is a rectangular, 2-story tall space of roughly 4000sf. The east 1/3 of the room is elevated as a stage with steps and a ramp separating it from the main floor. There is a locked exterior exit door in the northwest corner, and a second floor over look into the space to the south. Floor Plan for Snoqualmie-Powerhouse 1st Floor attached.

II. PROGRAMMING

A. Identity – this space if very central to campus, adjacent to the Grand Stair and Prairie Line Trail, and near the Mattress Factory that houses admin and some student services and the library buildings.
   a. All agreed that this could be a student-centric space.
   b. Students should have a feeling that it is a “student-owned” space.
   c. Activated all day long, even when not in use by an event; could be a lively space to show prospective student tour groups.
   d. There should be a buzz or energy in the space.

B. Events – the events held here should also be student-centric freeing up the other big event spaces to have more community focus. This would also start branding the spaces available for events (ie, The Y for athletic events, Carwein auditorium for movies and lectures, SNO-Powerhouse for student events.)
   a. Freshman Preview Day
   b. Convocation Day food and information area
   c. VMS welcome (approx. 50 people) and graduation events (approx. 200 people)
d. VIBE daily programming events

e. Before/after-hours key card study room

f. All day study/student meeting area.

g. Partner events with high schools (need supervision of entire room)

C. Branding/Aesthetic –

a. No cheesy or blatant UW purple and gold branding.

b. Showcase the beauty of the historic brick and powerhouse feel & keep the existing polished concrete floor.

c. Warm, historic, charming aesthetic.

d. A “special” space for students.

e. The photos in the current space are custom made for that space. Request to reuse them here or repurpose them elsewhere in the building.

D. Programming

a. Technology - A/V, sound system & mic, large projector/screen or video wall w/ camera & microphone for big events similar to TLB307, smaller screens & A/V for break outs or dividing the room, plentiful charging stations a must.

b. Lighting – need ability to dim and control lighting for technology and different events.

c. Windows – window treatments needed to dim and control lighting.

d. Acoustics are an issue in this space – tall ceilings, concrete floor. It is also currently open to the rest of SNO building & will need an ability to be acoustically and securely separated.

e. Grand entry directly into this space from outdoors.

f. Flexible furniture, suitable for adults, and easily reconfigurable. This includes tables of various sizes and heights on casters, chairs that are stackable but not tacky, whiteboards, technology, and soft seating.

g. Suggested reception area for sign-in tables for big events.

h. Suggested catering area (could be adjacent) with adjacent catering set up area.

i. Coffee cart adjacent.

j. Restrooms – ensure there are enough accessible to the space with Assembly occupancy. Access to non-gendered bathrooms preferred.

k. Storage – suggested storage configurations for furniture during various events. Everything should be configurable & storable in the Event Space itself.

l. Security & access to be determined at a later date for Snoqualmie Building

m. Management of space rental to be determined; schedule system “Live 25” recommended.

III. NEXT STEPS

A. McGranahan to study what we heard today and return with diagrams for future discussions.
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ITEMS DISCUSSED

I. PROJECT OVERVIEW
   A. The project has changed significantly since we last met.
      a. We are now looking at a complex reorganization of two buildings – Snoqualmie Building and Tioga Library Building.
      b. The programs involved are currently the Center for Equity and Inclusion (CEI), Vet Programs (VMRC, VMS, VIBE), the library, the Teaching and Learning Center (TLC), the Learning Commons (LC), the Office of Research (OR), and turning the Powerhouse into a student event space.
      c. The initial exploration for the CEI has been on hold since our Stakeholders Workshop back in July in order to set out on this new path.
      d. The idea is we can “provide CEI with a sustainable space solution while developing a long-range space utilization strategy for SNO/TLB.”
      e. To this end, the new path was attempting to hold true to the CEI activation date of Fall 2019 to open, while finding space and build outs for all the other student-centric programs.
      f. We are also tasked to keep in mind that space is a premium at the university and that shared programs and shared spaces can lead to innovation and collaborations that weren’t previously available.
   B. SNO/TLB Complex Reorganization (subject to change):
      a. Snoqualmie Building: Student Event Space in the Powerhouse, TLC, CEI, Vet Programs
      b. Tioga Library Building: Library, LC, OR, (and maybe the TLC)

II. BLOCK DIAGRAM LAYOUTS
   A. McGranahan presented (4) block diagram layouts for CEI in the SNO building – (2) on each floor.
      a. As we are trying to figure out where everyone in the reorganization will end up, if we are to meet the Fall 2019 schedule for CEI activation, the CEI would have to occupy the 1st floor of SNO as the TLC is currently occupying the 2nd and it will take time to move them.
b. If we push out the date of CEI activation and do a full master plan for all programs involved, the CEI could go on the second floor and share program space with other programs.

B. First Floor CEI

a. The way that SNO is set up, the main entry, main circulation, & the restrooms are spread out along the first floor. The two schemes look at maintaining access to restrooms and circulation while providing enough space for the CEI to function all together. There was some question by JM and TC about if the exit at the loading dock was necessary by code as the building official has unofficially signed off on it as is (in the storage room.)

b. (2) All gender single stall restrooms will be located on the 1st floor and would be adjacent to CEI spaces.

c. Option A
   i. Has less demo, using many of the existing walls to save money instead for building the new programs.
   ii. It also means that to maintain exiting, the CEI space is broken up by hallways.
   iii. The more active spaces (chill, incubator, kitchen) want to be near the front door to the CEI which pushes the classroom space to the exterior taking up many of the exterior views and natural light.

d. Option B
   i. Looks at getting all the CEI spaces together, which would mean more demo and a new, expensive exterior door for exiting.
   ii. Would be able to put the active student spaces (chill, incubator, kitchen) in the best area near the front door and with exterior views/natural light.
   iii. However, it leaves less exterior windows directly available for staff offices. SC concern about less natural light for full-time staff.
   iv. This adjustment of the SNO hallways cuts into the building strangely leaving some less than idea spaces for the Vet Programs.

C. Second Floor CEI

a. The 2nd floor is a great option for the CEI and Vet Programs together, though again some exiting must be maintained.

b. There is also a big mechanical room on the 2nd floor that cannot be moved or cut into for space.

c. The second floor will not have single stall, gender neutral rest rooms, but there are shared restrooms.

d. The layout upstairs lends the CEI being off the main stair while the Vet Programs are situated behind the elevator.

e. There are break out spaces along the bridge/hallway that would be great for extra desks or soft seating areas.

f. Option C
   i. Looks at separating the Vet and CEI programs. The main entry to the CEI would be on the hallway we create off the main stair and enters into the Incubator/Chill/Kitchen space.
   ii. The classroom gets the best space though, taking all the natural light and views along the exterior windows.
   iii. Office staff would be across the hall, but all staff would get exterior light.

g. Option D
   i. In this scheme, the classroom and a few small break rooms would be shared between the Vet Programs and the CEI. The roughly 640sf classroom space is requested by both programs to be
used periodically, but not fulltime. Sharing this space could create some dynamic partnerships between the two programs who have an overlapping student population.

ii. The entry to the CEI would be across from the main stair giving it a very visible location.

iii. All office staff would have access to natural light.

iv. Because the classroom is removed to the other side of the corridor, the Chill/Incubator/Kitchen spaces have more flexibility to be near the entry and capture the natural light from the exterior windows in this space.

D. Further Discussion
   a. CEI staff requested the power point diagrams for further study and to bring to their next staff meeting in order to understand the layouts and options better.

III. EVENT SPACE
   A. Last week, we met with Vet Programs, facilities, IT, events planners & administration. The CEI was meant to be there, but it seemed a missed email or miscommunication occurred. Future invites to go through Sara Contreras (CEI)
   B. We heard the Event Space should be an active, student-centric space.
   C. Active all hours for study, student meet-ups, and student events (convocation, catered, veteran’s graduation.)
   D. Warm, historic, charming aesthetic. (Not strict UW branding.)
   E. Flexible furniture for all types of events & meet-ups that can be easily reconfigured.
   F. Lots of tech to support big events and small group meetings.
   G. Outdoor access a plus.
   H. McG requests any information the CEI would like to add to this list.

IV. NEXT STEPS
   A. A second CEI block diagram layouts meeting is to be scheduled for the week of 11/26 (MP) to discuss concerns and comments about the four options to better understand the needs of the CEI going forward with all the programs.
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Agenda

- Project Overview & Schedule
- Programming Layouts for SNO Building
- Group Discussion
- Event Space Discussion (if time)
- Next Steps
Workshop Images

Open lounge space w/ soft seating.

Open incubator space with tables and chairs.

Open concept shared kitchen area.
Snoqualmie Building
SPACE LAYOUT DIAGRAM

- Option A – Level 1
SPACE LAYOUT DIAGRAM

- Option B – Level 1
SPACE LAYOUT DIAGRAM

• Option C – Level 2
SPACE LAYOUT DIAGRAM

- Option D – Level 2
Discussion
Event Space

- Met with Vet Programs, facilities, IT, events planners & administration
- We heard the Event Space should be an active, student-centric space.
- Active all hours for study, student meet-ups, and student events (convocation, catered, veteran’s graduation.)
- Warm, historic, charming aesthetic. (Not strict UW branding.)
- Flexible furniture for all types of events & meet-ups that can be easily reconfigured.
- Lots of tech to support big events and small group meetings.
- Outdoor access a plus.
Next Steps
MEETING MINUTES
CEI Programming Layouts Meeting 2, Nov 29, 2018
Prepared by: Shona Bose
4 December 2018

Attendees:
- Elizabeth Hyun, Space Planning Manager (EH) CRPS
- Pat Clark, Director of Campus Planning (PC) CRPS
- Melony Pederson, Project Development & Cons’t Mngr (MP)
- James McShay, Assistant Chancellor for Equity & Inclusion CEI
- Sara Contreras, Program Admin (SC) CEI
- Jennifer Meyers, Const PM, Facilities Services FS
- John Stevens, Network Manager IT
- Matt Lane, Principal/PM (ML) mcg-ARC
- Shona Bose, Project Designer (SB) mcg-ARC
- Seong Shin, Interior Design Principal (SS) mcg-ARC
- Shaquita Humphrey-Pressley, Director of Student Diversity (SHP) CEI
- Nedralani Mailo, Program Support Supervisor CEI
- Tessa Coleman, Facility Manager FS
- Stanley Joshua, Director FS

ITEMS DISCUSSED
I. BLOCK DIAGRAM LAYOUTS
   A. McG covered a quick overview/refresh of the four options and opened the floor for feedback from the CEI.
   B. Two schemes resonated more with the CEI – A & B on the 1st floor SNO
      a. Greater accessibility
      b. Greater visibility
      c. Adjacency to the all-gender restrooms
      d. Concern that TLC should stay on the 2nd floor if they feel a kinship for that space
   C. Option B Likes/Dislikes
      a. Likes
         i. Preferred option to be all in one contiguous space
         ii. Space is secure and visible by all staff.
         iii. Everyone (staff, faculty, student staff, student visitors) all enter through chill space to their destination. This allows for more opportunities for spontaneous collaboration & creates the sort of interconnectivity that is most important for the CEI
         iv. Staff would give up exterior windows in order for students to have views/natural light.
         v. Staff offices are configured in a cluster for greatest collaboration between staff.
         vi. Adjacent shared conference room is a plus.
      b. Dislikes
         i. Needs room for staff growth
         ii. If cost or time prohibitive, Option B is not okay
   D. Option A Likes/Dislikes
      a. Likes
         i. Shared break room with rest of the floor
         ii. Utilizes existing spaces
iii. Space is secure

b. Dislikes
   i. Some staff is disconnected from main student areas
   ii. Is there any way to enclose all the spaces from the hallway so that it feels more like one program?

II. PROGRAM QUESTIONS
   A. Does the CEI need their own Drop-in or Small Study areas if there are ones nearby?
   B. Does the CEI need their own Classroom if they can share one in the TLC or the Event Space?
   C. How will CEI future staff growth be handled? Currently there are 5 staff and looking for 2 more.

III. NEXT STEPS
   A. McGranahan is to conduct the same process with all the other agencies in SNO/TLB to establish programming
      needs for each unit.
   B. After this McG will put together block layout options for all programs in each building including the CEI taking
      into account the ideas gathered here.
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MEETING MINUTES
Library/TLC Walkthrough, Nov 19, 2018
Prepared by: Shona Bose
20 November 2018
Revised – 27 November 2018

Attendees:
- Elizabeth Hyun, Space Planning Manager (EH) CRPS
- Pat Clark, Director of Campus Planning (PC) CRPS
- Melony Pederson, Project Development & Cons’t Mngr (MP) CRPS
- Katie Comerate, Mechanical Engineer BCE
- Suzanne Klinger, Head of Research Help LIB
- Serin Anderson, Collections & Budget Lib LIB
- Lauren Pressley, Library Director LIB
- Dwayne Chambers, Assoc Dir Quantitative Ctr TLC
- Matt Lane, Principal/PM (ML) mcg-ARC
- Shona Bose, Project Designer (SB) mcg-ARC
- Seong Shin, Interior Design Principal (SS) mcg-ARC
- Henry Santos, Electrical Engineer BCE
- Hannah Wilson, Access Services Mngr LIB
- Tim Bostelle, Head of Lib IT (TB) LIB
- Justin Wadland, Assoc Director LIB
- Rebecca Disrud, Assoc Dir Writing Center TLC

ITEMS DISCUSSED
I. WALKTHROUGH
   A. TLC & Library leadership met with Campus Planning, McGranahan Architects & consultants to do a walkthrough of the SNO and TLB buildings.
   B. The intent was to meet and start to process the spaces and layouts each program uses currently; and start to understand what works and what doesn’t currently.

II. TEACHING AND LEARNING CENTER
   A. TLC shares part of 2nd floor of SNO with library services.
   B. TLC hours are M-Th 9am-7pm; Fri 9am-3pm
   C. The Library schedules all rooms in the building and all tech goes through the Library IT. Although the TLC has first rights to any rooms in the TLC, after hours they belong to the library.
   D. Power and data is a constant complication for all the tech TLC wants and needs.
   E. TLC Main Desk
      a. Students swipe in at front desk or at the (2) mobile kiosks.
      b. Faculty wall has photos of all faculty that are holding office hours at TLC on that day. Not all faculty have offices (they might be adjunct or just have a work station/desk) so they rely on the TLC having space do office hours or hold private meetings.
   F. Chihuly Room
      a. Shared library/TLC space. When not in use as a large conference room or classroom, it is open for quiet study.
      b. Art tours and school tours all come through to look at the Chihuly piece.
      c. Also used for (2) campus reading groups - the diversity group and the faculty development group.
      d. Collections in this room – faculty publications and student work.
e. Table and Chihuly piece go together and it is thought that they cannot be separated. EH/MP to investigate.

f. Power and data is tough in this room and is amplified by a power circle adhered to the table and gaff taped to the floor.

G. Main Tutoring Floor
a. Often every seat/desk is taken in peak times.
b. Quiet space is tucked around the corner, but acoustical separation is not resolved.
c. Each desk has a clicker with the ability to request tutoring services. The request goes to a receiver in DC’s office, then to the tutor iPads and TV mounted in the main room so everyone can see the order in which they will receive help.
   i. Library would also like to use this same service to determine when students need research help.
   ii. The clickers have a football field radius.
d. Floor boxes with power outlets do not work well people trip over the power cords or break them.
e. Currently putting in a big projector screen and ceiling hung projector (roughed in) but work has stopped due to the SNO/TLB moves that may happen with this project.

H. Offices
a. There are offices scattered all over the TLC area, tucked in behind the quiet area or through the break room.
b. Ideal offices would have sight lines to the Main Tutoring floor.
c. There are needs for private offices with small meeting areas, confidential records office, a hoteling office, etc. Final count TBD.

I. Kitchenette, lockers, break room for faculty, staff, and student staff. At any given time, there are 3-5 quantitative student tutors and 5-6 writing student tutors, plus a handful of student support staff. They use this area to secure their belongings and take breaks from the main tutoring floor.

J. Existing dark room that has been turned into storage.

K. Enclosed room with (currently 5) computers for writing tutoring. Could use more computers in this private or semi-private space.

III. LIBRARY (SNO)
A. Both library buildings are currently open 7:30am-10pm Mon-Thurs, 7:30am-5pm Fri, 9am-5pm Sat., and 10am-5pm Sun.
B. Library currently manage spaces in SNO/TLB complex, overseeing TLC spaces when it is closed. At student request, Library will be extending hours. One challenge has been the configuration of the two buildings. B/c of current flow, it is impossible to close-off a single building for extended hours.
C. It is confusing in the SNO Building for what is TLC and what is Learning/Research Commons.
D. Wayfinding from SNO to TLB is also confusing. The yellow footprints give students something to follow when research librarians sent them over to TLB to find their books in the main stacks. If these books are on the second floor of the TLB library, it gets even more confusing because of the elevator situation in TLB.
E. Library is managing two spaces in two different buildings which is a challenge.
F. Next quarter, the library intends to stay open til midnight.
G. Front Entry / Passthrough to Skybridge
   a. Soft seating area at front entry “passthrough” is very popular, but also confusing as a somewhat “leftover” space.
   b. Groups gather here when they need to be a bit louder, and sometimes partner agencies set up a table.
   c. There is a big book drop here and a couple display opportunities for new books to check out. There is also a book drop built into SNO front entrance.
   d. This area is directly in front of the main entry and makes it a bit disorienting for where to go next.

H. Access Services
   a. There are two main library desks – one in SNO and one in TLB
   b. Two workstations. Each desk needs at least 1 person to staff and at peak times, 2.
   c. Must be in line of sight of the front door.
   d. Laptop/equipment checkout (laptops are stored in carts behind this desk for check out,) book checkout, basic reference services, basic IT and printing support, directional assistance.
   e. Enforce Library Code of Conduct to keep building secure.

I. Staff Offices
   a. Located behind the Access Service desk.
   b. Circulating equipment collection in this room
   c. Has media roll out shelving that can be checked out at the main library desk
      i. Media technician workspace is currently adjacent to the media collection.
   d. Cubicles for tech students, reference assistants, and a shared office.

J. IT Desk
   a. Shared with Access Services desk.
   b. Helps with laptops, tech, can oversee the 3D printer & print station across the corridor.
   c. Easily accessible by students who need tech help
   d. TB sets up all tech for both TLC and all library programs. It is separate from the rest of UWT IT.
   e. Data and power comes down each of the columns and on the walls, so all the computers are clustered around those areas, but there are simply not enough for demand.

K. Research Help Desk
   a. Reference specialists answer complex range of questions here, but the service focuses on helping students with all phases of the academic research process.
   b. Needs to be visible but out of the main line of services for those who need extra help and have a few hours’ worth of questions.
   c. Benefits from proximity of the writing/tutoring TLC areas because writing and research are interrelated for students.
   d. Signage is new as of last year in order to help students find them. “Ask Us” sign on column.
   e. One particular challenge for the research help desk is to help students navigate to the main collection in the TLB and find/retrieve materials.

L. Instruction Lab
   a. Functions as a reservable teaching space for librarians collaborating with faculty for instruction sessions.
b. When not in use, it functions as a drop-in group space for students. Some clustered around screens to plug into. These are always in demand.

M. Periodicals & Newspaper Area
a. Soft seating near here is needed
b. Small periodicals area, but the collection is expanding. Endowed collection of literary magazines is coming that they will want to feature.

c. Room has screen, projector, podium for a variety of uses.

N. Practice Presentation Room
a. Constantly booked out.
b. Projector/screen/a/v area for students to practice their presentations.

O. 1st floor small group study rooms all have tech and white boards. (3) total.

P. Employee Only Area
a. Mech/Elec rooms
b. Employee break room with kitchenette (and fire safety systems)
c. Office

d. (2) gender neutral single-stall restrooms that are currently inaccessible to general population.

Q. Storage room & Loading Dock
a. Staging area for all the tech that comes in.
b. Area not big enough for those big deliveries (1-2 a year)
c. Not enough power/data for staging (only along 2 walls)
d. Loading dock and large doors are necessary for the pallets of computers that come through this area.

e. Also serves as a maintenance area for tech.

R. Main Floor Area
a. Used by students and public alike (though students have first priority). UWT library is open on Sundays when Tacoma Public Libraries are not.
b. Alumni computer station here – so that any alum can access UWT’s e-resources.
c. Computer stations along the walls have 2 monitors and enough space for 2 people at every desk or for 1 person with a lot of study materials to spread out.
d. Microfilm readers are here as well as VHS & other media stations. Microfilm readers are very loud with the focusing feature.

e. ADA computer terminal located here
f. Stacks –
   i. Writing help & resources easily accessible to the research help desk staff and TLC/writing tutors
   iii. Library to provide list of stacks and desks.

S. Powerhouse is currently quiet study for library but is tough because it’s open to a very active & loud space.

a. Powerhouse does not have enough power/data ports, but the ceiling is too high to do drops and the floor is finished concrete, so we would not want to cut into it for floor boxes.
b. Study carrels outside powerhouse are quiet library study computers.

T. The rest of the second-floor spaces - mezzanine, print area and study rooms (including (1) ADA study room) - belong to the library to manage.

IV. LIBRARY SKYBRIDGE
A. The skybridge connects TLB to SNO.
B. During the winter, the floor leaks and sandbags are put out. Could possibly because of the water table.

V. LIBRARY (TLB)
A. Current library design has some serious limitations and has not been optimally activated to serve the unique academic and co-curricular needs of UW Tacoma students.
B. Stacks – A library shelf is considered functionally full if it is 80% full. There needs to be room for growth.
C. Part of being a university library means there are different rules for managing the print collections. Rarely is it permitted to discard anything.
D. Wayfinding and navigation is challenging for the library in TLB. If you enter from the Skybridge, you enter into the library, but if you enter from Jefferson, it is unclear where to go.
   a. If you need to get to the 2nd floor of the library, you must go through the 1st floor and find the 2nd elevator. If you use the main elevator it will put you in a hallway outside of the secured library on the 2nd floor – you can see the library but not get into it.
   b. On the 2nd floor you can access the restrooms but not the drinking fountains from inside the library and vice versa if you are studying in the corridor.
E. Basement – Auxiliary Stacks
   a. Rolling stack shelving occupies roughly half of the 1st floor space. It rolls on heavy duty guides in the floor.
   b. There is an open office and microfilm area on one end of the basement. This office is for a librarian who needed more privacy for frequent consortial and tri-campus teleconferences.
   c. The open shelving near microfilm is used to process gift collections and manage shifting or weeding collection projects.
   d. There is a second workspace on the opposite side. Currently used by both part-time librarian and occasionally by graduate student employees.
   e. The rest of the area is given to corridor/circulation (elevator, keycard outdoor access, stairway.)
F. 1st floor
   a. Wish the entry would be much more inviting/welcoming. The giant wall that you enter to from Jefferson makes it unclear where to go. If the wall were removed the main circ desk would have line of sight on the front door (Jefferson side), which is the best practice in a library.
   b. (2) classrooms on this floor are used by UWT general and not scheduled by the library.
   c. There is also a staff lounge for whole building on this floor past the classrooms.
   d. Main Circulation Desk also has the reserves – professor identified reading and text books for scanning or kits to check out.
   e. Processing Room
      i. “Loading dock” from parking lot
ii. 1 shipment every day at 10 from other UW libraries and books to be processed.
iii. Processing area is not big enough to store the shipments and work on getting them processed.
iv. Staff office needs better oversight of processing area and circulation desk.
v. Intercom also here for both buildings (separate from whole school intercom.) Allows announcements to be made to one or both buildings, though speakers are hit and miss over in SNO. This system needs to be carried through TLB 3&4 floors if library occupies.
vi. Hold shelf in this room with materials sent from other library branches – a large part of circulation.

f. Stacks – Main collection and endowed Young Adult/Children’s section. (Children’s section needs better shelving – lower/kid friendly stacks.)

G. 2nd Floor
a. Only truly silent space, because 1st floor is walk through area.
b. Dedicated grad student study space. Grad students can reserve dedicated space in this enclosed room for private, individual study.
   i. Needs more tech.
   ii. Room heats up due to south side windows.
c. Climate controlled archival room houses Tacoma audio history in various formats. This room is not accessible though, so it is unclear how to allow patrons to view an archival collection. Also, the library does not yet have an archivist.
d. Library offices
   i. Open floor plan, not conducive to the complex work of librarians who often collaborate with faculty on campus, meet with students for consultations, and participate in online meetings.
   ii. Conference room is too small for everyone, and not acoustically separated enough.
   iii. The offices do not oversee the stacks/main floor which is problematic.
   iv. Some of the desks are for students or hoteling visiting staff.
v. Digitization desk with tech.
e. Separated Assoc Director office & office for 2 librarians off entry to the open offices.
f. Entry to office area used as work space w/ whiteboard or tea/coffee area.

H. A brief list of wants.
a. Need better high-tech active learning spaces for faculty/classes to interact.
b. Expansion of quiet study and individual work spaces.
c. At least doubling group study rooms: existing rooms are at capacity during peak times
d. A flexible, high-tech ”Engaged Scholarship Lab” which would enable librarians, faculty, graduate students, and potentially community members to meet and begin to design, develop, and implement projects. Might include:
   i. Data visualization space.
   ii. Smaller breakout & training spaces.
e. Secure space where faculty, students, and researchers can view special collections from UW Tacoma and as requested from the University Archives and Special Collections.
VI. NEXT STEPS

A. Library will provide McGranahan the information they have on programming, current stacks/collection placement, and other pertinent data.

B. Next, we will sit down for an extended workshop with the TLC and the Library to learn more about the programs and spaces each group needs going forward. This extended workshop will uncover what sorts of spaces are needed, quantity of spaces, spaces that want to be shared, adjacencies, etc.

C. MP to send out invite for TLC/Library Workshop.
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ITEMS DISCUSSED
I. INTROS AND RECAP
   A. This meeting was to gather TLC staff to get a sense of who the TLC is currently and what their needs are 
      going forward with this project in order to determine a full program of spaces and where in the SNO/TLB 
      complex will best suit these needs.

II. ENVISIONING
   A. To better understand where the shared goals are, we started with an envisioning exercise asking 
      questions and grouping answers together on the whiteboards.
   B. Question 1: Close your eyes and imagine the future of UW Tacoma. Provide some words that describe 
      your perfect TLC and other uses/spaces within your building.
      a. See image attached.
      b. The number one description used was “vibrant” or “active”.
      c. Also important is collaboration, welcoming, flexible spaces.
      d. Followed by room to grow, technology, comfortable and student oriented.
   C. Question 2: What is your idea of a premier student learning space?
      a. See image attached.
      b. Having a variety of spaces where people could study with multifaceted options is most important.
      c. Followed closely by access to the latest technology.
      d. Also important to create a premier learning space: welcoming, easy to find, bringing nature in, 
         comforting and secure.
      e. Others mentioned: faculty involvement, security, and food/coffee options.
      f. For precedent, look to Georgia State Learning Commons as a premier learning space.
D. Question 3: What activities do you see in the future of your building?
   a. See image attached.
   b. The focus here was on varied tutoring areas (group, private, quiet, remote) and varied study areas (quiet, noisy, group, large, presentation practice w/ tech.)
   c. Also very important was private staff offices.
   d. Other activities would be technology access and workshops, extending the hours, projects students can join, places to have casual conversations, and a café.

E. Question 4: If you could change anything about the current TLC, what would you change and in what order of priority?
   a. See image attached.
   b. The number one change wanted is to have more space.
   c. This is followed by better acoustics.
   d. Also important is having a variety of spaces to accommodate many different study/learning styles, tech and tech support, more workshop spaces.
   e. Others mentioned: offices with sight lines to the tutoring floor, having one entry for student check in and navigation, and natural light (with reduced glare on computer screens).

III. PROGRAMMING
A. The TLC needs to be a safe and welcoming environment.
B. They prefer to be in a central location as it is such a heavily used student resource.
C. The “natural partner is the library.” Proximity to or integration with the library is preferred, but concerns about taking up valuable library space, if they need it.
   a. Other concerns about TLB – higher floors would be harder to navigate to and the TLC would perhaps lose some student involvement by the fact that they are out of the main visibility on campus.
D. CEI adjacency - it is unclear if they have overlapping program with the CEI. (There is concern about CEI events that are too noisy and not study-focused.)
E. Concerns about cafes/retail food space – a café would take up valuable space in the building, take money and a company to operate and could take away from the overall urban servicing campus experience that has many coffee shops adjacent.
F. Spaces needed:
   a. Main entry with a front desk staffed by students for check in, orientations, and a list of what help is available.
   b. Main Teaching Floor
      i. Current desk space is 80 but feels full at 60. Would like space to comfortably fit 120.
      ii. Needs a variety of soft seating and desk space, both with enough room to spread out and study/tutor comfortably.
      iii. Flexible furniture solution is preferred for the times the space needs to shift, or for students who want to move a chair or desk to feel a bit more enclosed.
      iv. Sometimes large events such as a beginning of the schoolyear orientation or various workshops are held here which need a large projector screen a suitable technology.
   c. Other Tutoring Spaces
i. Some tutoring is done over the computer.
   1. E-tutoring is where students email in their paper, tutors edit the draft, and then email it back. This is a quiet task, that also needs a quiet room for focus.
   2. Synchronous/remote tutoring is done over Skype and thus requires a quiet, individual room with a computer that a tutor can be loud in.

ii. Group tutoring/study – needs for various group sizes (from 4-40)
   1. Group tutoring rooms should be able to be reservable or “break out” space that is 1st come 1st served.
   2. Like the current variety, but they are at capacity the majority of the time.
   3. Also need for a 40-person classroom.

iii. Technology
   1. Need a variety of computing spaces – laptop-docking, dual-monitored spaces, desktops w/ 8’ of space for spreading out and tutoring, desktops with 3’ of space for a more enclosed feel, etc.
   2. Important to reduce glare on the screens.
   3. Need much more power and data to handle current and future tech.
   4. Floor outlets are bad – everyone trips over them.

iv. Staff Offices
   1. Currently, 8 staff share 2 to an office apart from private offices for admin, head of writing tutoring, and head of quantitative tutoring.
   2. Prefer to have all private offices, but a strong desire to at least not have an open office with cubicles.
   3. Staff often have to do the loud, synchronous tutoring sessions via skype, have intricate work they need to focus on in a quiet or low murmur environment, or have a sensitive topic they need to discuss with a student.
   4. All offices need to have a view to the main tutoring floor for better supervision.
   5. Offices need not be large – just enough for a desk.
   6. If enough private/huddle spaces to do loud work, then prefer for open work stations (not cubicles.)
   7. UWT standard is moving towards larger, open areas for office space with furniture solutions instead of walls. These new types of “cubicles” have higher glass or private “walls”, are more sound-resistant, and can have doors.
   8. Further discussion is needed regarding staff offices and EH/MP are looking into getting images of furniture solutions.

v. Faculty Spaces
   1. 25 faculty use the TLC to hold their office hours. These are usually adjunct professors who have no desk/office on campus. But there are others who like to hold some office hours at the TLC as a way to interact with students or offer students a less overwhelming space to approach them.
   2. Faculty are capped at 20 at any given time but would like this to be 30 in future.
   3. They mostly prefer to sit on the main tutoring floor and do grading until a student needs them.
4. Sometimes a session will turn into a bigger group study session where students will push a few tables together or find a break out room. Would like both solutions available but need to find a way to gather a small study session on the main floor and be acoustically separate. Movable whiteboards would also be good for this situation.

5. Would also like a space to do faculty development – classroom for up to 40.
   a. This idea needs to be more fully fleshed out at the operational level.
   b. Could be a faculty library space.

   d. Tutors
      i. Currently there are 30 student tutors, but this will grow as UWT grows. This will also grow when UWT adds in Engineering degrees which will have a need for more Quantitative tutors for engineering as well as more writing tutors (because every student is required to write.)
      ii. Tutors need a break room to store food and eat lunch (with area for food prep & storage, a sink, kettle, microwave, etc.) as well as a place to safely secure their belongings.

   e. Tech Stations
      i. Needs both tutoring stations, quiet stations with a sense of “enclosed” space,

IV. NEXT STEPS

   A. From this meeting McG to put together a list of program areas and square footages.
   B. Next meeting – 12/19
   C. Future meetings – Library Site Visits and a Library/TLC Design Charrette
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Q4: CHANGE CURRENT

MORE SPACE
1. More space
2. More high density
3. More open

ACOUSTICS
1. Better acoustics
2. Noise reduction
3. More open

VARYED SPACE
1. Variety of space
2. More open

TECH
1. More tech support
2. Tech workspaces

WORK-ROOMS
1. More tech workspaces
2. Tech support

OFFICES/SIGHTLINES
1. More private
2. More sightlines

ENTRY
1. More entry

LIGHTING
1. Natural light

TUTORS
1. More for highest priority
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ITEMS DISCUSSED
I. INTROS AND RECAP
   A. This meeting was the first time McG sat down with Library staff to determine their needs.
   B. Prior to this meeting, UWT Library shared a list of program areas, a diagram of program spaces as laid out currently in SNO/TLB, and a space profiles document to better understand the current Library footprint.
   C. This meeting gathered library staff to start envisioning what the future of the UWT Library could look like and start to reimagine the current spaces consolidated.
   D. Currently, the focus of these meetings is on programming and test fit to determine preliminary budget and scope of the future build out. Timeline for construction is still undergoing leadership study and will be contingent on funding.

II. ENVISIONING
   A. To better understand where the shared goals are, we started with an envisioning exercise asking questions and grouping answers together on the whiteboards.
   B. Question 1: Close your eyes and imagine the future of UW Tacoma. Provide some words that describe your perfect Library and other uses/spaces within your building.
      a. See image attached.
      b. We combined many of the words used into a broad “Welcoming” category that included access, safety, inclusivity and inviting as the number one category to create a perfect library.
      c. Also important is Technology, Flexibility, and being Central/Visible to campus.
      d. This was followed by being Collaborative and a Community Hub.
C. Question 2: What is your idea of a premier learning space?
   a. See image attached.
   b. Two main groups emerged here for a premier learning space – an inspiring, synergistic place and a flexible, varied space. Students come to the library with so many different needs and study styles. Even in the same day one student will require a variety of ways to work. Being able to serve students on every scale is paramount to the resources that the library provides.
   c. Also important is comfortable, connected, open, and natural light.
   d. Others mentioned: embedded learning, modern, expert-rich and student-ownership of space.

D. Question 3: What activities do you see in the future of your building?
   a. See image attached.
   b. Collaborations were the number one mentioned change for the library building. This was filled out by dialogue space, faculty collaborations, group work spaces, and team meeting space.
   c. This was followed by a research-focused, knowledge production theme.
      i. UW Tacoma libraries are unique in that they are heavily research based and help students understand how to do good research.
      ii. If you combine this theme with collaboration, UWT library could see itself helping faculty understand and teach how to do in depth research that generates high-quality knowledge.
   d. Another important aspect to the future library would be to have a variety of different learning spaces including maybe a maker space, an experimental classroom, or community-based learning spaces.
   e. Other mentions: quiet, secure study space, technology/user experience, and there being a nearly limitless answer to this question.

E. Question 4: If you could change anything about the current Library, what would you change and in what order of priority?
   a. In the future, the library will be even more central and important to learning at UWT. Many students come to UWT without having previous tech access and will need access to it through the library where there will be available user experience help.
   b. The number one change wanted is more space generally, including more quiet space, more group study rooms, more classroom space and more collaborative space.
   c. This if followed by comfort with better acoustics, better lighting that doesn’t dim as the sunlight increases which makes for bad task lighting, and flexible furniture.
   d. Also important is more power/tech receptacles and a more accessible collection (ie, it is hard to find a book or periodical in the non-displayed rolling shelves in the basement.)
   e. There is a need for better or more offices and desks that can supervise out.
   f. Other things to change would be the library identity and a more welcoming entry, a way to separate SNO from TLB without being segmented across campus, having a Learning Commons, being adjacent to other operations, and having an appropriate place for parents to bring in children (ie, the children’s collection on child-friendly shelves and a place for parents to work.)
III. PROGRAMMING

A. Next, we did a programming exercise based off the square footage provided by the library of the existing footprint out of both buildings. Without thought to floors or specific buildings on campus, the whole group collaborated to show adjacencies between various program elements.

a. See attachment for layout images and video for further explanation of adjacencies.

b. Near the main entry would be a reception area perhaps with a small welcome desk

i. Next one would enter a more open collaborative/event space are with popular browsing and new collections.

ii. This could be supervised by the circulation desk adjacent to offices, reserves collections and a book processing area with an improved layout that is conducive to processing books. Book processing is always to be adjacent to the Book Delivery area.

iii. Research Help desk has proximity to the circulation desk, with browsable collection, classroom, consultation space, media & microfilm stations, and some offices.

iv. IT Service desk wants to be centrally located as tech is distributed throughout.

v. All three desks (circulation, IT, and help desk) want proximity to each other so that the circulation desk can take over all functions after IT and Research Help have shut down for the day.

vi. Collections were broken up throughout the spaces and used as separators and acoustical buffers. Technology and study rooms are also spread out throughout.

vii. Towards the front of the building (more visible), a technology lab, study space and collections with a tucked away family space that has adjacency to the children’s collection on appropriate shelving.

viii. Towards the back (more private space) quiet rooms, quiet collections, quiet tech, scholar lab.

ix. The bank of staff offices is central to the main collections that are spread out closer to students.

c. Through this process additional program spaces were added:

i. More reservable group study rooms

ii. Enlarging the conference room.
iii. Family Space adjacent to the children’s/YA collection and lactation room
iv. (2) Classroom Spaces not necessarily adjacent to each other.
v. Break up the open staff floor plan into small offices or acoustically separated work spaces with doors.
vi. Open collaborative space
vii. Event space

B. Through this exercise we also started to take this adjacency diagram and break it out onto various floors knowing that wherever the library ends up, it will be on various levels. Here, we ended up with 3 floors and a basement of adjacency diagrams.

a. Basement
   i. Basement Stacks
   ii. Storage
      iii. Media Collection (220sf from SNO)

b. 1st Floor
   i. Main Entry and all main help desks – access services, circulation, research help & IT.
ii. Main entry opens into a reception area, open collaborative space, popular collections and event space.

iii. The circulation desk is central to the floor surrounded by back of house (processing, reserves and offices), family space and children’s collection.

iv. IT help desk is central, but off to one side surrounded by tech heavy spaces.

v. Research help desk is also on this floor tucked more away surrounded by offices, classroom space, microfilm & A/V tech, and consultation space.

c. 2nd Floor

i. The second floor is populated with a core of various study spaces flanked by collections and overseen by the main staff offices with break room and bigger conference room.
i. The third floor has lots of quiet space interspersed with quiet collections and smaller break out study rooms with a few offices to supervise or offer help when needed.

A. **NEXT STEPS**

A. Melony (MP) to coordinate with library over images/boards and social media campaign regarding the SNO/TLB complex project.

B. Next Meeting – 12/19: McG to draw out adjacency diagrams based off the ones developed at this meeting to be used in discussions of what needs to be added or moved, and to start the discussion around what other UWT units the library could share space with or be adjacent to.

C. Future meetings – Library Site Visits and a Library/TLC Design Charrette.

Submitted by
Shona Bose
Project Designer
McGranahan Architects
Distributions: Meeting attendees, Matt Lane
Attachments: Larger images from exercises; video
Q1: TWO WORDS TO DESCRIBE YOUR PERFECT LIBRARY

ACCESS  FLEXIBILITY  TECH  COLLAB  CENTRAL  COMMUNITY  INVITE

ACCESSIBLE  FEMALE  HIGH TECH  Collaborative  Central  Community

AVAILABLE  Interface  Information  Collaborative  CENTRAL  Central

CONNECTED  Varied (women)  Involve  Involve  Central  Community

Accessible  Enterprise  And come from...  Technology  Central

ABILITIES  Enhance

INVITE TO

ACCESSIBLE

OFF MEETING

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
SNOUTER COMPLEX
PROJECT A030234
AUGUST 2023
Q2: WHAT IS YOUR IDEA OF A PREMIER STUDENT LEARNING SPACE?

INSPRRE
Inspiring
Responsive

COFORT

CONNECTIVE
Collected Sensory

FLEXIBLE
Flexible
Adaptive

VARED/ADAPTABLE
Varied

OPEN
Spacious

SYNERGY

McGRANAHAN architects

LIBRARY KICK OFF MEETING
UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON TACOMA
SNO/TLB COMPLEX
PROJECT NUMBER: 150574
DECEMBER 2006
Q3: WHAT ACTIVITIES DO YOU SEE IN THE FUTURE OF YOUR BUILDING?
Q4: NAME THE TOP TWO THINGS YOU WOULD CHANGE ABOUT YOUR CURRENT SPACE

- MORE SPACE
- COMFORT
- NATURAL LIGHT
- ACOUSTICS
- MORE TYPES OF SPACES
- VARIOUS SOUNDS - MURMURS
- Better organization of furniture
- More comfortable furniture
- Be more open
- MORE SPACE FOR PROGRAMMING/Events
- MORE DESKS
- More
- Less
- Furniture
- Sittable furniture
- Flexibility / Space / Resources
- More easy Access
- MORE DESKS
- Great
- EVADED
- Appropriate space for various to being discussions
- Appropriate space for various
- More
- More
- MORE DESKS
- More
- Less
- Furniture
MEETING MINUTES
TLC Meeting 2, 19 Dec 2018
Prepared by: Shona Bose
21 December 2018

Attendees:
- Elizabeth Hyun, Space Planning Manager (EH) CRPS
- Pat Clark, Director of Campus Planning (PC) CRPS
- Melony Pederson, Project Development & Cons’t Mngr (MP)
- Bonnie Becker, AVC for Student Success UWT
- Rebecca Disrud, Assoc Dir TLC
- Jen Cooper, Social Sci Writing Consultant TLC
- Carolyn Maxson, Program Coord TLC
- Margaret Lundberg, Writing Consultant TLC
- Hannah Wilson, Access Services Manager Lib
- Tessa Coleman, Facility Manager FS
- Jennifer Meyers, Const Project Manager FS
- Matt Lane, Principal/PM (ML) mcg-ARC
- Shona Bose, Project Designer (SB) mcg-ARC
- Seong Shin, Interior Design Principal (SS) mcg-ARC
- Asao B. Inone, Dir of Univ Writing UWT
- Dwayne Chambers, Assoc Dir TLC
- Su-Miao Lai, QI Consultant TLC
- Carly Gelarden, Sci Consultant TLC
- Kelvin Keown, Writing Consultant TLC
- Timothy Bostelle, Head of IT Lib
- Stanley Joshua, Director FS
- Nedralani Mailo, Program Support Supr CEI

ITEMS DISCUSSED
I. INTROS AND RECAP
   A. This meeting was to further explore the programming needs of the TLC & clarify ideal adjacencies of program elements.

II. PROGRAMMING
   A. In the first exercise used the program areas document (see attached) to develop the program further and to better understand the room/area needs.
      a. Tutoring Spaces
         i. Want to adjust the quiet tutoring floor by 9 (for a total of 25 seats) and decrease the main tutoring floor by the same.
         ii. The main tutoring space is also where big events and orientations will happen, so it will need a projector and screen.
         iii. It is ideal to have orientations (5/2/1 days for fall/winter/spring quarters) in the TLC space because they happen the week before the quarter opens for tutoring, and it is good to have the students orient in the same place that tutoring happens so that they are already comfortable with the TLC setup.
         iv. Tutoring spaces need a variety of seating (movable furniture, soft seating, flex seating) interspersed with technology or ability for tech like tables with screens that students can mirrorcast to.
         v. Also, a need for white boards both fixed and movable.
b. Study Rooms
   i. Classroom can be shared. No frequent need but would use for things like the accounting
      workshop or bigger meetings.
   ii. Would prefer to have a classroom available w/ scheduling privileges in same building.

c. Technology
   i. Current = 20 computer stations. Would like to increase that to 30 total.
   ii. (20) 8ft, double monitor desktop stations in/near main tutoring floor
   iii. (10) 4ft, private, individual stations near the quiet tutoring floor or in their own quiet
      space. It is important that these spaces be private like in study carrels otherwise students
      tend to not want to use them.

d. Admin/Staff Spaces
   i. 85-90% of all work done by all staff is creative, process oriented, or individual tutoring
      work that needs privacy and acoustic separation.
   ii. Offices would need walls that go all the way to the ceiling for sound and a door that
      closes and locks.
   iii. Transparency is good to be able to see who is in the offices and for staff to view the
      tutoring floor.
   iv. Total of 8 offices are needed.
   v. An “assistant” desk isn’t needed, but an IT station for Tim is.
   vi. 2 larger associate directors offices with desk and space to meet with 2-3 people
   vii. 1 program coordinator office, secured for sensitive files
   viii. 5 smaller individual offices where staff can have a desk and space to meet with one
      student
   ix. All offices need a desk with space to write and a CPU with dual monitors, prefer sit/stand
      desks (but the sit/stand version attached to a stationary desk they currently have is
      working just fine), softer lighting preferred with additional task lighting, coat hooks,
      storage for files and books.
   x. Synchronous/Remote rooms need to be acoustically separate with desk space for dual
      monitors and one student tutor. Only need 2-3 of these spaces and they can be located
      away from the staff offices where student tutors can access them best.
   xi. E-tutoring spaces – only need for 5 CPUs with monitors.

e. Support Spaces
   i. Current 540sf breakroom/kitchenette is too big, but 200sf is too small.
   ii. Would like to be able to use break room for culture building and trainings (up to 13
      people) with a conference table for 10 with a screen/tv/display.
   iii. Breakroom/kitchenette together with tutor lockers, a locked cabinet for charging (9)
      tutor ipads, storage room for extras, and area for color printer/office supplies and a coat
      rack.
   iv. Ideally the kitchen has a sink, coffee, tea, refrigerator, microwave.
B. The second exercise we did was to cut out the program areas and do an adjacency exercise with the whole team.

a. The Main Entry, Check-in Desk, and Coordinator’s office should all be up front. The Program Coordinator directly oversees the check-in staff. No second entrance is ideal, so everyone can funnel through one space.

ii. The offices should overlook the main tutoring floor and ideally have windows or natural light access. They don’t necessarily have to be all together, but they do need to have adjacency to the main floor.

iii. Here the “ASST 40SF” is a stand in for the IT help desk.

iv. Study rooms can tuck in anywhere.

v. Breakroom, e-tutoring and synchronous tutoring can be away from the main floor and away from the offices so that student tutors have some privacy to their work spaces.

vi. Tech can be interspersed throughout the main tutoring floors.

vii. Shared classroom is nearby in the same building, but not necessarily part of the TLC.
III. NEXT STEPS

A. From this meeting McG to put revise the list of program areas and square footages & add room summaries.

B. Next meetings
   a. Library Site Visits – 1/2/19 & 1/4/19 (CARPOOLING ENCOURAGED)
   b. TLC/Library Charrette 1/16/19

Submitted by
Shona Bose
Project Designer
McGranahan Architects

Distributions: Meeting attendees
Attachments: Program Areas document, How do you work PowerPoint
Area Summary PROPOSED
11 December, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutoring Spaces</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Tutoring Floor</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Tutoring Floor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Tutoring Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,080</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Rooms</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Study (3-6 people)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Group Study (9-15 people)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Practice Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom (40 people)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Study Rooms</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,860</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Stations</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Computer Stations (8’ Stations)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Computer Stations (4’ Stations)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Technology</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>645</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admin/Staff Spaces</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Dir Offices</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinator Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Staff Offices</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synchronous/Remote Tutoring or Hotelling Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-tutoring Spaces</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Admin/Staff</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,010</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Spaces</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reception Desk, &amp; Check-in Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor Lockers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchenette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Support Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
<th>Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Program Area</td>
<td>7,995</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation as a % of Net Program Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walls/Structure as a % of Net Program Area</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Summary EXISTING</td>
<td>11 December, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tutoring Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Tutoring Floor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet Tutoring Floor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Tutoring Spaces | 96 | 2,400 |

### Study Rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small Group Study (3-6 people)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Group Study (9-15 people)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Practice Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Study Rooms | 6 | 1,405 |

### Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Computer Stations (8' Stations)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Computer Stations (4' Stations)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Technology | 20 | 725 |

### Admin/Staff Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assoc Dir Offices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Manager Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Offices (2-3 per office)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-tutoring Spaces</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Admin / Staff | 14 | 1,165 |

### Support Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reception Desk, &amp; Check-in Station</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break Room/Kitchenette</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Support Spaces | 3 | 740 |

### Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Program Area</td>
<td>6,435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HOW KNOWLEDGE WORK HAPPENS
How do you work along or together

CHAT
Chat is an incidental and impromptu interaction with a colleague

CONVERSE
Converse is a purposeful interaction between 2-3 colleagues who address a defined topic.

CO-CREATE
Co-Create is the generation of new ideas and content among groups.

DIVIDE & CONQUER
Divide & Conquer happens when a team with a common goal finds it valuable to work on individual components of a project while maintain close proximity to one another.

HUDDLE
Huddle occurs when a team needs to address an urgent issue, or discuss and receive instructions for a plan of action.

WARM UP, COOL DOWN
Warm Up, Cool Down occurs in the time leading up to and immediately following more formally scheduled engagements.

SHOW & TELL
Show & Tell is a planned gathering at which information is shared among teams, with clients and colleagues, or more broadly to the organization.

PROCESS & RESPOND
Process & Respond is the work generated by work. It occurs in response to the feedback loop of emails, phone calls, texts, and messages that drive work forward.

CREATE
Create occurs when a person engages with the specific content associated with their role, solves problems, and develops deliverables.

CONTEMPLATE
Contemplate is an opportunity for an individual to pause and consider the best way forward in their work, or ignore it momentarily and provide respite.
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PRELIMINARY PRIVATE OFFICE WORK STYLE CONCEPT TO ACCOMMODATE INDIVIDUAL NEEDS

MODULAR COMPONENTS
Typical to support different work styles
PRELIMINARY PRIVATE OFFICE WORK STYLE CONCEPT TO ACCOMMODATE INDIVIDUAL NEEDS

WORK STYLE-1
Solo work with or without sliding privacy panel

WORK STYLE-2
Semi-private with potential mobile small meeting table and a guest chair

WORK STYLE-3
Open collaboration with shared mobile team work table or files

MODULAR COMPONENTS
Typical to support different work styles
MOVABLE WALL SYSTEM

COST-EFFECTIVE TO ACCOMMODATE CHANGES
ACOUSTIC PROTECTION
DISTRIBUTES POWER AND DATA
USER EMPOWERMENT WITH BROAD RANGE OF DESIGN AND MATERIAL OPTIONS
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
MOVABLE WALL SYSTEM

BEFORE – UWT MILGARD SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
MEETING MINUTES
Library Kick-off Meeting, 19 Dec 2018
Prepared by: Shona Bose
1 January 2019

Attendees:
- Elizabeth Hyun, Space Planning Manager (EH) CRPS
- Pat Clark, Director of Campus Planning (PC) CRPS
- Melony Pederson, Project Development & Cons’t Mngr (MP)
- Lauren Pressley, Library Director LIB
- Suzanne Klinger, Head of Research Help LIB
- Cecil Brower, Library Access Services LIB
- Marisa Petrich, Librarian LIB
- Megan Saunders, Evening Circulation Tech LIB
- Serin Anderson, Collections & Budget Lib LIB
- Dwayne Chambers, Assoc Dir Quantitative Ctr TLC
- Stanley Joshua, Director FS
- Jennifer Meyers, Const Project Manager FS
- Matt Lane, Principal/PM (ML) mcg-ARC
- Shona Bose, Project Designer (SB) mcg-ARC
- Seong Shin, Interior Design Principal (SS) mcg-ARC
- Justin Wadland, Assoc Director LIB
- Hannah Wilson, Access Services Mngr LIB
- D’Andre Williams, Library Access Services LIB
- Alaina Bull, Librarian LIB
- Marcia Monroe, Library Student Supervisor LIB
- Tim Bostelle, Head of Lib IT (TB) LIB
- Rebecca Disrud, Assoc Dir Writing Center TLC
- Tessa Coleman, Facility Manager FS

ITEMS DISCUSSED
I. INTENT
   A. This meeting was to further explore the programming needs of the Library & clarify the character of program elements.

II. PROGRAMMING
   A. Using the attached Area Summary, we discussed the types & number of spaces and what their qualities are.
   B. Collections
      a. Main floor collections needs to be on lower shelves that allow for better visibility of all the service point desks & activities happening.
      b. Media shelving unit will need to be brought over from SNO and will remain only accessible by staff. When students need an item from the media shelving, staff retrieve it to the circulation desk.
      c. YA/Children’s collections are endowed collections and would like to have prominent space available. The collections are separate, and the YA should be visible to students. However, the children’s collection can be in its own area adjacent to a children’s reading area, lactation room, and visible to a service desk for help. The library would like to have a lactation room as they are the building that holds the longest hours on campus.
   C. Service Point Desks
      a. All service point desks want to be collocated on the main floor, but not adjacent to each other. Such proximity would create confusion of services.
b. A total of (3) desks – Circulation Desk, Research Help Desk, and IT Services Desk.
c. Each desk has different needs all serving UWT students and library patrons
d. Circulation Desk
   i. The circulation desk is the main library desk. It should be prominent on the main floor so that visitors can immediately recognize it and orient themselves to it.
   ii. There needs to be check-out stations for (3) workers including at least one ADA station. Each terminal has a book code scanner, dual screen computer station, (preferably) built-in book sensitizer, and at least (2) shared phones. There is also a shared printer.
   iii. The check-out stations need enough room for queueing up to 4 people deep.
   iv. This desk includes a return book drop/return media drop.
   v. The circulation desk is responsible for the Reserves Collection and needs large shelving for larger text books and curriculum boxes.
   vi. At this desk there needs to be room for (3) dedicated book carts.
   vii. Adjacencies – processing, (3) staff offices, lockers that student workers can reserve.
   viii. Current processing area is not ideal for the work – Library to send more information on the work done here.
e. Research Help Desk
   i. This desk needs space for (2) workers with dual-screen computers each and consultation space for short one-on-one consultations.
   ii. Adjacent, (2) staff offices are needed as well as a consultation room for up to (5) people. The consultation room will be for larger or longer research help consultations and will need tech necessary to do so – large screen, computer, whiteboards.
   iii. Also near this desk a bank of dedicated computers for students to continue their research in the proximity of available help.
f. IT Help Desk
   i. IT Help desk needs a desk space for (2) people and lots of power/data ports. Currently this desk would have a CPU at it, but eventually, it would be a mobile tech station where the tech goes with the IT person.
   ii. The IT Help desk could be inside a computer lab that could potentially be open longer hours than the library itself with alternative access points.
   iii. This computer lab would have the main set of computers (up to 24 dual monitors 8’ stations), the 3D printer, and a print station.
   iv. Adjacent would be the main IT Office (could be shared or hoteling office.)
   v. Somewhere in the building, a space for repair/receiving for tech equal to the size of the loading dock storage room in SNO.
D. Study Rooms
   a. An undetermined number of one-person study pods is desirable
      i. A variety of tech and acoustical separation - some with dual-screen computer, a few with A/V equipment to record and replay practice presentations, some fully acoustically separated, some private but not acoustically separate, some public.
      ii. These can be in or adjacent to silent study.
   b. (18) total 4-6 person study rooms with tech.
i. There is a lack of 4-6 person, reservable study rooms around campus.
ii. These rooms can get loud and should be separated from the quiet study areas.
iii. Total study rooms can be shared between TLC and Library.
c. Classrooms – the two existing classrooms would be a good size for the future library.
   i. Ideally, classrooms could be set up with movable furniture and movable walls so that
      they can be reconfigured as library space when not in use.
   ii. The smaller of the two TLB classrooms would be ideal for a high-tech classroom or lab
      space, while the larger would be ideal for bigger lectures or hosting two classes together.

E. Silent Study
   a. Silent study should be distributed throughout the library as well as concentrated in one large
      space where up to (120) students can study around other students who are studying.
   b. Furniture should be varied between soft seating, divided long desks, 3-person tables, and
      individual spaces.

F. Collaborative/“Talk Zone”/Soft Seating
   a. Event Space
      i. Room for 60, staff parties, collaborative class activities
      ii. Must be a space that is inspiring and a space that showcases that the events held here
         are Library events – not just another campus classroom.
      iii. Flexible furniture
   b. More Soft Seating zones wanted
   c. Learning Commons discussion postponed to a later meeting date.

G. Technology
   a. Need for 24 study carrel computer stations in the silent study areas and 24 larger stations on
      various floors or shared in a computer lab space.
   b. ADA station should be on the 1st floor

H. Admin/Staff Offices
a. Various office configurations – top row: larger offices with space for desk and meeting area; middle row: smaller office spaces with desk space and one-on-one consultation; bottom row: shared/open office spaces with access to private meeting rooms.
b. Every librarian has public and private work to do.
c. Collaborative work happens in meetings, but then everyone goes back to their offices to do private work.
d. “Zoom” is used for online meetings which happen frequently due to collaboration with other UW libraries.
e. Offices can be smaller – not everyone needs a meeting area space.
f. Everyone does need acoustical separation with a door & transparency/line of sight to the rest of the floor.
g. Need both satellite and clusters of offices. Clustered offices need a “reception desk” of sorts.
h. No offices need to be on completely silent floors. Silent floors only need wayfinding.
i. Library to collect more information on how many staff, how many offices, and what sorts of desks, furniture, & storage casework is needed for each office.

I. Other Spaces
   a. Secure Archive Viewing Room
      i. This would be a new space for UWT where archive collections from Seattle could be housed and viewed.
      ii. More thought needs to go into what such a space looks like or if it is required.
   b. Scholar Lab
      i. Primarily a place for librarians to consult with faculty.
      ii. Space for faculty to interface with their work, research, grad students, and research help/pedagogical advice.
      iii. Would need tech and whiteboards & consultation space.
      iv. Look at Virginia Commonwealth University Scholar Lab for precedent

III. NEXT STEPS
A. From this meeting McG to put revise the list of program areas and square footages & add room summaries to create a draft Ed Spec.
B. Next meetings
   a. Library Site Visits – 1/2/19 & 1/4/19 (CARPOOLING ENCOURAGED)
   b. TLC/Library Charrette 1/16/19

Submitted by
Shona Bose
Project Designer
McGranahan Architects
Distributions: Meeting attendees
Attachments: Powerpoint of Office Spaces, Area Summary Document
### Collections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNO 122</td>
<td>New Materials Shelf</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 122D</td>
<td>Media Collection (Special Shelving)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 130</td>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 150</td>
<td>Reference Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 180</td>
<td>Small Collections, Maps/Atlases, Foundation Center</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 1</td>
<td>Compact Shelving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 1</td>
<td>Microfilm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 1</td>
<td>A-G Stacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>1,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 1</td>
<td>YA/Children’s Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 2</td>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 2</td>
<td>H-Z Stacks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>3,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 209</td>
<td>Special Collections (Controlled Archive Room)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Archive Viewing Area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Popular Browsing Collection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Collections Spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,660</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,010</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Service Point Desks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNO 130</td>
<td>Circulation Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 130</td>
<td>Access Services/IT Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 150</td>
<td>Research Help Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 1</td>
<td>Circulation Desk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 1</td>
<td>“Reception”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 210</td>
<td>“Reception”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Service Point Desks</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,305</strong></td>
<td><strong>90</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Study Rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>112-4, 136B</td>
<td>Small Group Study (3-6 people, ADA)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 139</td>
<td>Medium Group Study (9-15 people)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 139</td>
<td>Large Study Room / Classroom (24-40 person)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 207</td>
<td>Grad Student Study Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small Group Study w/ large screen computer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium Group Study (9-15 people)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large Study Room / Classroom (24-40 person)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Study Rooms</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,430</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,950</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quiet Study Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNO</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNO 112-14</td>
<td>Powerhouse Silent Study</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 1</td>
<td>Silent Study</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 2</td>
<td>Silent Study</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal Quiet Study Areas</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,850</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Collaborative/"Talk Zone" Areas/Soft Seating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNO 122</td>
<td>Soft Seating (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 150</td>
<td>Soft Seating (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 160</td>
<td>Normal Talk Zone Area (20 person)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 170</td>
<td>Soft Seating (6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Collaborative Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNO 110</td>
<td>Student Computer Stations (Indiv Study Carrels)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 130</td>
<td>Student Computer Stations (10 computers, printer, 3D printer)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 150</td>
<td>Student Computer Stations (6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 160</td>
<td>Student Computers (6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 170</td>
<td>Tech (1 Computer, ADA Station, 2 Microfilm)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Admin/Staff Offices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNO 122C</td>
<td>Open Offices (4) + IT Service Desk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 136A</td>
<td>Staff Office for 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 140D</td>
<td>IT Staff Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 106A</td>
<td>Staff Office for 2 (Access Services / Manager)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB B</td>
<td>Desk Space (Serin’s “office”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB B</td>
<td>Desk Space (Anna’s “office”)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 219A</td>
<td>Staff Office for 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 201B</td>
<td>Assoc Dir Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 208A</td>
<td>Director’s Office</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 208</td>
<td>Open Offices &amp; Copy/Printer Area</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Admin / Staff Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Support Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SNO 140C</td>
<td>Break Room/Kitchenette/Lockers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNO 140E</td>
<td>IT Storage Room at Loading Dock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 106B</td>
<td>Circ Processing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB B</td>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLB 208B</td>
<td>Conference Room</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enlarge Conf Room

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal Support Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seats</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Totals

| Net Program Areas | 28,460 |
| Total Net Program Area (Existing + Additional) | 5,150 |
| 33,610 |
MEETING MINUTES
Library Site Visit #1, 2 Jan 2019
Prepared by: Shona Bose
3 January 2019

Attendees:

- Pat Clark, Director of Campus Planning (PC) CPRS
- Elizabeth Hyun, Space Planning Manager (EH) CPRS
- Melony Pederson, Project Dev & CM (MP) CPRS
- Lauren Pressley, Library Director LIB
- Suzanne Klinger, Head of Research Help LIB
- Cecil Brower, Library Access Services LIB
- Marisa Petrich, Librarian LIB
- Megan Saunders, Evening Circulation Tech LIB
- Serin Anderson, Collections & Budget Lib LIB
- Dwayne Chambers, Assoc Dir Quantitative Ctr TLC
- Jen Cooper, Social Sci Consultant TLC
- Carolyn Maxson, Program Coordinator TLC
- Margaret Lundberg, Writing Consultant TLC
- Stanley Joshua, Director FS
- Jennifer Meyers, Const Project Manager FS
- Matt Lane, Principal/PM (ML) mcg-ARC
- Shona Bose, Project Designer (SB) mcg-ARC
- Seong Shin, Interior Design Principal (SS) mcg-ARC
- Justin Wadland, Assoc Director LIB
- Hannah Wilson, Access Services Mng LIB
- D’Andre Williams, Library Access Services LIB
- Alaina Bull, Librarian LIB
- Marcia Monroe, Library Student Supervisor LIB
- Tim Bostelle, Head of Lib IT (TB) LIB
- Rebecca Disrud, Assoc Dir Writing Center TLC
- Su-Miao Lai, QI Consultant TLC
- Carly Gelarden, Science Consultant TLC
- Kelvin Keaun, Writing Consultant TLC
- Tessa Coleman, Facility Manager FS
- Bonnie Becker, AVC Student Success UWT

ITEMS DISCUSSED

I. OVERVIEW
   A. The Pierce College Library was designed by McGranahan and constructed in a phased Cascade Building remodel.
   B. It has been open for 8 years.
   C. Seong Shin and Christie Flynn, Dean of Library and Learning Services, gave an overview of the design process and construction prior to the commencement of the tour.

II. NOTES FROM CHRISTIE FLYNN
   A. Pierce College decided to triple the size of their library at a time when the trend was to make libraries smaller.
      a. They did this with data that showed that the library really helped student engagement on campus.
      b. The library also had a clear motto on campus to encourage student engagement and help to do so by embedding librarians in mandatory first year classes in order to help students better understand and use the library.
   B. Think about who your campus partners are
      a. The Writing Lab is in the library while the rest of tutoring is outside the library and up the stairs.
         Although there is ability to check out spaces in the library and request that as an area to meet up with tutoring staff.
b. PCL would like to have more storage for reservable tech now but hadn’t anticipated this large of a laptop collection. Other departments store their reservable tech here because the departments don’t have ability to track check-outs or fine students when overdue.

C. Celebrate the construction process. It will feel long and arduous, so find small and big ways to celebrate milestones within the process.
   a. For a phased closing of one library area, Pierce College held a “Grand Closing” where they did demolition fundraisers to celebrate the end of the old and the beginning of construction.

D. Decision Making
   a. Build trust between exec team, library team, and faculty with data and clear priorities.
   b. Pierce College leadership had all the final decision-making power, but the library made a very clear case for choosing to do it innovatively.
   c. There can get to a point where there are too many options, and someone just has to make a final decision and stick to it.

E. Break Room/Kitchen
   a. The library fought for having two small kitchenettes - one by the classroom spaces and one in the staff space.
   b. They fought for this by having a clear goal of campus engagement showing that the kitchenette off the classroom would be used as an event space where they host all sorts of faculty celebrations and campus mixers.

III. PIERCE COLLEGE LESSONS LEARNED
   A. Know your UWT philosophical framework before starting
   B. Understand what UWT needs from the library
   C. Ask/expect to be challenged if you want to innovate
   D. Furniture variety as a critical piece to success
   E. Know how you want to incorporate media, technology & urban Community Spaces

III. NEXT STEPS
   A. Next meetings
      a. Library Site Visit 1/4/19 (CARPOOLING ENCOURAGED)
      b. TLC/Library Charrette 1/16/19
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PIERCE COLLEGE
Cascade Library Project Story
Presentation Prepared for UWT Library Team
January 2, 2019
Agenda

- Cascade Building Project History
- Pierce College Vision
- Cascade Building Master Planning Process
- Cascade Building Overview of Multi-phased Project over 14 years
- New Library design story
- Tour
- QA
Fort Steilacoom Campus
Pierce College Vision
Campus Connection
Overall Phasing Diagram
Overview of Multi-Phased Project

- Phase 1: 2005 – 2009
  Main Entry, Welcoming Center, Student Services, Library, Exterior Upgrades

- Phase 2: 2007 – 2010
  North Entry, Library and Faculty Suites

- Phase 2.1: 2010 – 2013
  Exterior Upgrades, Dental Lobby Addition

- Phase 2.5: 2010 – 2013
  Performance Lounge, Cafeteria, Classrooms, Exterior Upgrades

- Phase 3: Projected 2017 – 2021
  Dental Hygiene, Vet Tech, Misc. Interior renovation, Exterior Upgrades
Before
Main Entry
Before
Back Entry
After

Main Entry
After
Back Entry
After

Entry Signage
After

Welcome Center
Library Design – Phase 2
Ask

- What new questions did we need to ask? Who were we in this system? What was the role we could play to move the institution to its goals further/faster?

Learn

- What could we learn from others?

Connect

- How could we work together in new ways with our faculty and other units? How can the library support this activity
**Borrow**

- What were others doing well? From people, books, media, resources

**Reflect**

- As we progressed.... Revisited ideas...

**Design**

- What did these ideas look like when translated into physical design...
Library – 4th floor

Key
a  Library staff
C  Circulation
Cr  Classroom
Is  Informal group study
M  Media lab
Os  Organized group study
P  Periodicals
Q  Quiet study
r  Reference
s  Social/food area (chat and chew)
sc  Staff computer
w  Writing center
Library – 3rd Floor
Library – 5th Floor

Key:
a  Library staff
b  Circulation
cr  Classroom
is  Informal group study
m  Media lab
os  Organized group study
p  Periodicals
q  Quiet study
r  Reference
s  Social/food area (chat and chew)
sr  Staff computer
w  Writing center
Design Concept
Student Involvement
Student Involvement
Colors + Materials
Before
Before
Before
Information Zone
Reference Desk
Living Room Zone
Quiet Discussion/Collaboration
Social Zone
Small Group/Surf the Net
Silent Zone
Focused Study
Quiet Zone

Individual Study
Shared Learning Zone

Impromptu Group Discussions
Shared Learning Zone
Media Group Discussions
Quiet Zone
Informal Reading
Your Project

- Know your UWT philosophical framework before starting
- Understand what UWT needs from the library
- Ask(expect to be challenged if you want to innovate
- Furniture variety as a critical piece to success
- Know how you want to incorporate media, technology & urban Community Spaces
MEETING MINUTES
Library Site Visit #2, 4 Jan 2019
Prepared by: Shona Bose
4 January 2019

Attendees:
- Pat Clark, Director of Campus Planning (PC) CPRS
- Elizabeth Hyun, Space Planning Manager (EH) CPRS
- Melony Pederson, Project Dev & CM (MP) CPRS
- Lauren Pressley, Library Director LIB
- Suzanne Klinger, Head of Research Help LIB
- Cecil Brower, Library Access Services LIB
- Marisa Petrich, Librarian LIB
- Megan Saunders, Evening Circulation Tech LIB
- Serin Anderson, Collections & Budget Lib LIB
- Dwayne Chambers, Assoc Dir Quantitative Ctr TLC
- Jen Cooper, Social Sci Consultant TLC
- Carolyn Maxson, Program Coordinator TLC
- Margaret Lundberg, Writing Consultant TLC
- Stanley Joshua, Director FS
- Jennifer Meyers, Const Project Manager FS
- Matt Lane, Principal/PM (ML) mcg-ARC
- Shona Bose, Project Designer (SB) mcg-ARC
- Seong Shin, Interior Design Principal (SS) mcg-ARC
- Justin Wadland, Assoc Director LIB
- Hannah Wilson, Access Services Mngr LIB
- D’Andre Williams, Library Access Services LIB
- Alaina Bull, Librarian LIB
- Marcia Monroe, Library Student Supervisor LIB
- Tim Bostelle, Head of Lib IT (TB) LIB
- Rebecca Disrud, Assoc Dir Writing Center TLC
- Su-Miao Lai, QI Consultant TLC
- Carly Gelarden, Science Consultant TLC
- Kelvin Keaun, Writing Consultant TLC
- Tessa Coleman, Facility Manager FS
- Bonnie Becker, AVC Student Success UWT

ITEMS DISCUSSED
I. OVERVIEW
   A. We toured UW’s Odegaard Undergraduate Library and the Research Commons space in Allen Library.
   B. John Danneker, Director of Learning Services gave us an overview (PowerPoint attached) and showed us around Odegaard.
   C. Odegaard was first constructed in the 1972 and remodeled during 2012-2013 with $16.5mil in mostly state funds.
   D. Odegaard has 1.6mil visitors annually, and they are seeing visitors stay longer per visit.
   E. Library is open 24/5 with access by keycard and student ID check from 7pm-7am.
   F. The renovation happened as many stacks were being moved off campus and consolidated around the university. This freed up the library to think anew about what Odegaard could be.

II. NOTES FROM ODEGAARD LIBRARY
   A. Renovation focused mostly around the 1st floor, 2nd floor, and skylight to transform the 1970s space into a living laboratory.
   B. 1st Floor
      a. Open space used for many different activities – students arrange and rearrange this space as needed for study, collaboration, reading. There are also several study spaces including booths, enclosed rooms, and open tables.
b. Active Learning Classrooms – (2) classrooms reserved by campus and (1) reserved through the library. The library fought for these classroom spaces even though they take up more square footage than a regular lecture classroom.

c. All classrooms open up as library space (extra group study/individual study areas) after hours.

d. There is a hard floor area for study space where students can have food.

e. Open holds area – unmanned book hold area where students pick up their requested materials.

f. Research/Writing center – the research help and writing center are co-located even as they are separate programs overseen by different departments. This proximity allows tutoring help to easily flow between the programs.

C. Mezzanine

a. The administration area is tucked away in the back-mezzanine level. There are offices, open desk spaces, break room, copy room and conference room.

b. Open work stations work for their operations

c. Limited staff offices did not take into account expansion of office need, so it is unclear where to put new positions that require enclosed office space.

D. 2nd Floor –

a. The 2nd floor has the IT help & check-out desk. 1st floor has a wayfinding desk, but Odegaard is so open that students can come in and easily orient themselves to the space.

b. The desk is in front of a browsable collection and the course reserves area.

c. Also on this floor are two large computer labs with offices for the tech/lab support.

E. 3rd Floor –

a. Used the updated fire code to enclose the 3rd floor in glass, making the stacks the only truly silent space in Odegaard.

b. Ran out of money to truly remodel these spaces, so looking into that now.

F. Skylight – opening up the library to natural light was one of the best moves they made. Especially here in Seattle where it is overcast much of the time, it was important to the library that more natural light was available at all levels of the library.

G. 16 study rooms currently, but every space is booked out. Not necessarily going to add more rooms, just more flexible study spaces.

III. NOTES FROM THE RESEARCH COMMONS

A. The Research Commons in Allen Library South was a response to library stacks being consolidated, the atmosphere on campus in 2007, and a need from students for a new kind of study space.

B. It is used by many STEM undergrad students who need the white board/tech/small group study space that the Research Commons provides.

C. The entire remodel was done with furniture, carpet, and paint – no walls were demo’d or built.

D. Presentation space is great for grad students and a variety of presentations – anything from a Ted Talk/high stakes atmosphere to a laid back presentation space.

E. Tech consultant space – area for students to get research tech help. One wish is that they had more room for this and that it was more prominently displayed with a data wall perhaps.

F. Wish they had a dedicated grad space with key card access.
IV. LESSONS LEARNED
   A. Partnerships across divisions has led to better user experience
   B. Respect and learn from culture of collaborative partners
      a. Creating a space to match a common vision is rewarding
      b. But challenges still remain – relationships take ongoing work!
   C. Assessment plans are critical for shared spaces
   D. Allow flexibility for organic changes to occur
   E. Be willing to stretch your ideas of what libraries “should” be doing

V. NEXT STEPS
   A. Next meeting: TLC/Library Charrette 1/16/19

Submitted by
Shona Bose
Project Designer
McGranahan Architects
Distributions: Meeting attendees
Attachments: PDFs of OUGL Renovation Presentation & Co-location to Collaboration Article
Building On -- and For -- Collaboration

2012-13 Renovation of Odegaard Undergraduate Library

John Danneker
Director, Learning Services
University of Washington, Seattle
BACKGROUND
Undergraduate Libraries

● FROM CONCEPTION, A PLACE FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING
  ○ (RELATIVELY) SMALL COLLECTIONS
  ○ WORK SPACES WITH PROXIMITY TO ASSISTANCE

● OVER TIME, SHIFTS FROM STUDY HALL TO GROUP WORK TO COMMONS

● NOW A LIVING LABORATORY THAT SERVES AS A MULTIDISCIPLINARY MODEL
Odegaard Undergraduate Library

- ODEGAARD OPENED IN 1972 AS CENTER FOR LIBRARIES’ TEACHING AND LEARNING
- SECOND-LARGEST AND SECOND-BUSIEST LIBRARY IN SYSTEM (1.6 MILLION ANNUAL VISITS)
- HOUSES STAFF FROM LIBRARIES AND SERVICE PARTNERS
MOTIVATION
Pressures and Needs for Renovation

- STEADY INCREASES OF UNDERGRADUATE POPULATION
- CHANGING PEDAGOGICAL MODELS
- AGING BUILDING NOT KEEPING UP WITH MODERN USES
Opportunities via Renovation

● PROVOST COMMISSIONED A CROSS-CAMPUS GROUP TO PRODUCE A NEW VISION FOR ODEGAARD BUILDING

● VISIONING REPORT COMPLETED IN 2010
  ○ RECOMMENDS A CENTER FOR LIBRARY TEACHING AND LEARNING THAT MODELS THE 21st CENTURY WORLD UNDERGRADUATES WILL MOVE INTO
  ○ CREATE NEW SPACES FOR FORMAL AND INFORMAL LEARNING AND INTERDISCIPLINARY SHARING
RENOVATION
Renovation 2012-13

- $16.5 MILLION, MAJORITY STATE FUNDING
- COMPLETED IN 2012-13, TIGHT TIMELINE, BUILDING REMAINED OPEN FOR MOST OF WORK
- GRAND RE-OPENING FALL 2013

HONORS
- AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS 2014 HONOR AWARD
- LIBRARY JOURNAL “NEW LANDMARK LIBRARIES” 2016
Collaborative Learning Spaces

- BLENDING OF FORMAL AND INFORMAL LEARNING SPACES IS HALLMARK OF RENOVATION

- TWO VERY DIFFERENT PARTNERSHIPS YIELDED TWO VERY DIFFERENT LEARNING SPACE CONCEPTS
  - WRITING AND RESEARCH CENTER = partnership created organically, through collaboration over time; new space formalized relationship in new way
  - ACTIVE LEARNING CLASSROOMS (ALCs) = created, planned, purposeful partnership from beginning; new space heavily researched in advance and post-occupancy
The Odegaard Writing and Research Center (OWRC)

- LARGEST WRITING CENTER ON CAMPUS, SERVES THOUSANDS OF STUDENTS ANNUALLY
- CO-OPERATED BY LIBRARIES AND COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
- RENOVATION WAS OPPORTUNITY TO CREATE A SPACE TOGETHER
Creating a Space for Learning: the OWRC

- ALL SERVICES OCCUR IN SAME SPACE

- ACRL FRAMEWORK CONCEPT OF “RESEARCH AS INQUIRY” APPLIES TO ALL SERVICES -- INQUIRY IS USED AS COMMON LANGUAGE

- RESEARCH AND WRITING ARE ITERATIVE, COEXISTING PROCESSES
Lessons Learned: OWRC

- RESPECT AND LEARN FROM CULTURES OF COLLABORATIVE PARTNERS
  - CREATING A SPACE TO MATCH A COMMON VISION IS REWARDING
  - BUT CHALLENGES STILL REMAIN -- RELATIONSHIPS TAKE ONGOING WORK!
- ASSESSMENT PLANS ARE CRITICAL FOR SHARED SPACES
- ALLOW FLEXIBILITY FOR ORGANIC CHANGES TO OCCUR
The Active Learning Classrooms (ALCs)

- PURPOSEFULLY RESEARCHED AND DESIGNED -- NEW SPACES FOR UW TO RESPOND TO CHANGES IN PEDAGOGY
- ORIGINALLY LIBRARY CONTROLLED, NOW GENERAL-ASSIGNMENT CLASSROOMS
- SEVERAL HUNDRED CLASS SESSIONS HAVE BEEN HELD SINCE FALL 2013, ACROSS SCIENCES, HUMANITIES, AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
Creating a Space for Learning: The ALCs

- COLLABORATION AMONG LIBRARIES, ACADEMIC TECHNOLOGIES AND CENTER FOR TEACHING AND LEARNING

- FORMAL LEARNING SPACE OPTIMIZED FOR ACTIVE LEARNING DURING DAY

- WALLS OPEN AT NIGHT FOR 24-HOUR STUDENT USE (INFORMAL LEARNING)
Lessons Learned: The ALCs

- PARTNERSHIPS ACROSS DIVISIONS HAS LED TO BETTER USER EXPERIENCE

- ASSESSMENT PLANS CAN YIELD GREAT RESULTS
  - QUANTITATIVE DATA, AND OBSERVATIONS TELL RICHER STORY
  - POSITIONING OF LIBRARIES AS LEADERS AND FACILITATORS IN PRACTICE

- BE WILLING TO STRETCH YOUR IDEAS OF WHAT LIBRARIES “SHOULD” BE DOING
First Floor as Crossroads
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ABSTRACT
Through collaboration with faculty and other campus partners, libraries have become centers of innovation in teaching and learning with technology. The authors, representing library, technology, and program staff from partnerships at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, will present a framework based on Joan Lippincott's definitions of co-location, cooperation and collaboration. Learn how to assess and develop your partnerships and how the diversity and adjacency of learning spaces, resources, services, and staff are redefining the library and the library's role within an academic institution.

INTRODUCTION
Joan Lippincott (2009) defines the characteristics of different levels of partnerships: co-location, cooperation, and collaboration, and regularly refers to these levels in talks and presentations (p. 26). This chapter explores more in-depth definitions of each level, and provides some examples from the University of Wisconsin-Madison to illustrate such partnership levels. Partnerships can evolve from one level to another, and examples of that evolution will help readers understand that a library can use this framework to shape or transform their work with others. By providing an overview of relationship factors to consider when assessing the levels of your own alliances, other institutions will understand the dynamics of those partnerships better. You can approach a new relationship with a mindset that allows you to choose the level you want for the highest benefit to your library, to the partnership, and to the users served by the alliance. Ultimately, a full collaboration can allow for a redefinition of the role of the library in the academic institution by shaping the library's contributions to the academic success of students in new ways.

The learning objectives for this chapter are:

- Understand the framework of co-location, cooperation, and collaboration in order to assess current and future partnerships.
- Learn the factors that define relationships in order to determine the appropriate types of partnerships for your library.
- Identify opportunities to change or help library partnerships evolve in order to support the institution's role in student retention and success.

BACKGROUND
As library collections move online and analog collections are weeded, academic libraries are repurposing spaces once used to house physical collections. These developments present libraries with an opportunity to partner with colleagues from across campus in order to pilot instructional initiatives and expand academic opportunities for the communities being served. In addition, library space is being used to provide students with increased access to academic support services including assistance with research, writing, digital design, tutoring services, and academic advising. In fact, David Lewis (2007) cites this opportunity as a key strategy that can help create the model for academic libraries of the future: "Re-develop the library as the primary informal learning space on the campus. In the process partnerships with other campus units that support research, teaching, and learning should be developed" (p. 420). At the same time, libraries are also being transformed by student expectations related to food and beverage services and ubiquitous wifi and electric power. Many campuses are making a considerable investment in library spaces to meet these expectations and bring together additional services. In an exploration of the library's new role in the learning spaces landscape, Appleton, Stevenson, & Boden (2011) note that the "success of new or refurbished library buildings with their long opening hours and strong emphasis on service culture has led to a recognition that it can be both more efficient and more satisfactory for students to provide a range of university services such as welfare counselling and academic support in the library building" (p. 349).

During times when the library is less likely to be at capacity, library space is being repurposed as managed classroom space that emphasizes the use of instructional technology. Lin, Chen, & Chang (2010) write, “the design of academic libraries has changed dramatically in recent decades as a result of digital technology and new pedagogy formats, and will undoubtedly continue to change” in their review of principles and conditions affecting space and learning (p. 349). In reflecting on how libraries are participating in the digital university, Lippincott (2015) notes that “many libraries have reinvented themselves in substantial ways, with new types of collaborative spaces for active learning, with technologies and services that enable library users to create new multimedia products and not just view films or listen to audio, with very different configurations and expertise of staff, and with significant investment in digital information resources” (p. 292). Libraries continue to evolve from places traditionally dedicated to quiet contemplation and study to destinations that provide a variety of different types of spaces that offer silent, quiet, and group study. Use of the library as a “third place” that supports community and
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UW-Madison's College Library, the campus library with primary service to undergraduates, does not have a designated "commons" space. Instead, the library presents its services and partnerships holistically as a variety of resources that collectively support student academic success, without the commons nomenclature. The library is in many ways typical of academic libraries serving an undergraduate population. College Library includes a café, spaces with varying levels of technology services, instructional classrooms, active learning spaces, collaborative and individual study space, and collections that support both academic and recreational interests. The library is open 24 hours, five nights a week during the fall and spring semesters and is a heavily-used space that is popular with students.

Some partnerships in College Library date back decades, and others have occurred only in the last few years. Using Lippincott's definitions of co-location, cooperation, and collaboration, the authors have identified which of the partnerships fit which level, including those that have evolved from one level to another over time. By sharing experiences through the use of these examples, it should help others in their assessment of such relationships and provide a method for determining if and how those partnerships are operating at the desirable levels.

CO-LOCATION EXAMPLES

Open Book Café

Like many libraries, College Library opened a café as a way to provide the type of amenities students demand in their preferred study spaces. The Open Book Café (see Figure 1) opened in April 2003 and offers sandwiches, soup, salads, pastries, and bottled juices and smoothies, in addition to coffee beverages. The café is managed by the Wisconsin Union, which also manages the two student unions on campus as well as a number of other food outlets in other campus buildings. The Open Book Café is therefore run in a manner that fits the overall management model of numerous cafés and deli shops for the Wisconsin Union and that partnership is not unique with the library.

Figure 1. Open Book Café
© Brent Nicastro. Used with permission.
Moving from Co-Location to Cooperation to Collaboration

The level of partnership is co-location because the café operates independently of the library. The library provides the space and the Wisconsin Union provided the funding to create the café in the library space. The Wisconsin Union also hires and manages staff who work at the café. Ultimately, the partner manages all aspects of the café. Therefore, the partnership is characterized by a strong sense of Us (the library) and Them (the Wisconsin Union).

There are numerous issues that are part of this strict delineation of management. The primary one from the perspective of the library is that the Open Book Café can reflect positively or negatively on the library. Even though the café is a visually distinct space within the library, from the student perspective that distinction is rarely evident. If there is bad coffee or long lines, it can reflect poorly on the library, even though the library does not control café products or manage café services. The library receives feedback about café products and services that are passed along to the café management to provide response, but the library cannot have a direct impact on making changes based on user feedback as is done for comments received about library resources and services. In fact, the library often is unaware if the café even responds to the feedback in any way.

Also, café goals and priorities are independent of library goals and priorities. The library can identify a traffic flow concern by noticing students’ inability to traverse through the crowded space between the café cash register and a rack of quick-grab candy and packaged snacks. However, café management might feel that their goal of expanding sales at the point of purchase overrides the library’s goal of ensuring an easy flow of student traffic in that area. In this example, the café’s priority for potential last-minute sales is not aligned with the library’s priority of ensuring a good user experience in terms of student traffic in that area.

Another aspect of this level of co-location is that the communication between the library and café management is minimal. Café staff members do not attend library staff meetings and library staff members do not attend café meetings. When the library makes decisions about library hours (for example, closing early during a blizzard) it’s an extra step to remember to include the café in that decision, both in terms of discussing the impact of the decision on their service and communication of such decisions to café staff. At the same time, the café hours are determined by the café with minimal input from the library. For example, during exam week the café closes on Thursday, even though exams run through Saturday and the library remains open through the end of the exam period.

In addition to issues around service hours, facility announcements, such as an out-of-order elevator, are regularly shared with library staff and often forgotten to be shared with café staff. As the library’s partnerships have expanded, the need to develop a solution to such facility-related communications became clear. The library now has an email list that includes all partner email addresses so that any facility issues or changes to building hours are broadcast to all partners who provide services within the library. Overall the partnership is generally successful and students like having a café in the library.

SAFEwalk

SAFE Nighttime Services includes SAFEwalk, which provides walking escorts throughout campus in the evening (from 7pm-1am). Managed by campus Transportation Services, students are trained by the UW-Madison Police Department and work in two-person teams to provide escorts as requested by students during late evening hours as a secure and safe way to walk to one’s destination on campus. College Library serves as a “home base” for SAFEwalk teams during evening hours. Teams are stationed in the library wearing visible orange jackets and the library provides a sign indicating the availability of the service. The dispatch part of the service occurs in an office nearby, but not within the library. When the team stationed in the library is required to provide the service, they leave and another on-call team then arrives to wait for their dispatch.

SAFEwalk hours are determined by Transportation Services with no input from the library. Communication between the Transportation office and the library is minimal. Governance and goal setting are both separate. SAFEwalk personnel do not attend library staff meetings, and the space they use within the library is clearly library space that they are “borrowing” during certain hours of the day. Aside from input on the signs being used, because the library works to ensure a consistent approach to signage, there is very little interaction between the SAFEwalk community and the library community. Problems are addressed at the management level not at the front-line staff level. Because the library is the only 24-hour public space on campus and because a large number of students are in the library every evening, the co-location is logical and beneficial.

COOPERATION EXAMPLES

Software Training for Students

Software Training for Students (STS) offers free technology training and project support for UW-Madison students. They provide open classes and workshops throughout the semester as well as course-integrated workshops. STS has been one of the primary users of the computer lab classroom within College Library. STS is administered and managed by the UW-Madison Division of Information Technology (DoIT). DoIT also provides funds that support the computer lab. The partnership with STS has many of the characteristics that are present in the library’s co-location partnerships plus additional characteristics that move this partnership from co-location to cooperation.

As the primary user of a hands-on classroom located within the computer lab, STS has worked closely with library staff to schedule use of that classroom. The equipment in that classroom was purchased with money provided by their parent organization, DoIT. As their needs have changed (e.g. need for larger classroom space), the library has discussed ways that the partners might work together to provide the additional seats required. This has included use of the new active learning spaces in the library as well as planning for renovation and expansion of the computer lab classroom so that the end result is a space that works for their needs.

The library shares costs with DoIT to create spaces that meet the needs of STS. While the space is still library space and managed by library staff, the use of some of the library spaces by STS takes precedence over use by other campus entities. They receive priority scheduling in the computer lab classroom and also get opportunities to shape the planning of the new classroom. That said, STS is a service that is managed and administered outside of the library. The partners meet together only as needed and there are no standing meetings between STS and library personnel. The library does not join with STS personnel to set goals or make decisions about their programs or services. There is little interaction between/among STS staff and library staff. However, this cooperative relationship is more than a simple co-location of services.
Student Services Area

The Student Services Area (see Figure 2) provides a space that can be reserved by student academic support services to provide one-on-one drop-in instruction and advising within College Library. This space is centrally located on the first floor of College Library with close proximity to the library's combined service desk (reference and circulation services) and close to the entrance of the library.

The partnerships associated with the library's student services area (tutoring, advising, writing center instruction, and others) share many of the characteristics of the co-location partnership, however the library has taken steps over the years that reflect more of a cooperative relationship. On occasion the library brings together the units and services that regularly reserve space within the student services area and everyone shares their experience and knowledge of what works in terms of reaching students and discusses how to improve these services, including resources that the library can provide, such as locked cabinets, printing services, signage, etc.

In her definition of cooperative partnerships, Lippincott (2009) explains that cooperation allows personnel to learn about each other's services and expertise, which can lead to new types of services (p. 62). There are several examples of this in connection with the student services area partners. The first time the library meets with a new prospective partner, the partner gets a tour of the entire library. This is done so that they learn about library services and expertise, which can help develop other partnerships. Sometimes this sharing leads to new types of services.

One example is the partnership with Career Services. After the library tour and having seen some other learning spaces, they worked with the library to schedule a summer workshop series to help recent graduates in their hunt for employment. This workshop series proved to be very successful. The following year they had a chance to see a newly remodeled learning space within the library. One of the spaces, the Media Studios, includes technology that Career Services hoped could allow a new approach to their workshop series. Career Services then moved their workshop to the Media Studio classroom so that they could take advantage of the technology in that newly renovated space. In this new space, they added a number of Skype sessions with UW-Madison alumni as part of the workshop series. By continuing to share information about the spaces in the library, the partner was able to adapt their service to take advantage of newly remodeled classroom space that enhanced their workshop.

Figure 2. College Library student services area
© Brent Nicoletta. Used with permission.

COLLABORATION EXAMPLES

Computer Lab

The computer lab has been part of the library since the late 1980's. At that time, it was even considered a bit risky to put a computer lab in a library. What did that mean in terms of defining computing as a library service? How would it change the culture of the library to have students come to the library and potentially just use the computers? For the past twenty years, however, the integration of computing services with library services became the foundation for the concept of the Information Commons. While computer labs in libraries are no longer risky or cutting edge, there are a variety of approaches to computing services: a computer lab in a library run completely by IT (co-location); a computer lab in a library run completely by the library (library service, no partnership); or a cooperative or collaborative approach.

At UW-Madison, there are campus-supported computer labs in many locations; some are in libraries and some are in places such as student unions and residence halls. The computer labs are supported through funding from a student technology fee, which not only covers all of the software licenses and hardware costs, but can also be used for furniture and remodeling expenses associated with the computer labs. The UW-Madison Libraries and the DoIT computer labs do not all follow the same partnership model. In Memorial Library, the computer lab is co-located in a section of the library that is completely outside of access to regular library services. That computer lab is staffed completely by DoIT with policies and procedures driven by campus computing services and not by Memorial Library.

However, in College Library the computer lab is very much operating as a collaboration. The collaborative effort with campus computing services began with the agreement that College Library would provide space for the computer lab, along with staffing and management. Initially, the library integrated its media services into the computer lab, providing circulation of closed collections like art slides and music reserves. Much has evolved over the years but the key aspect of the partnership is that it is one of collaboration and the services have evolved together through the partnership.

One key example of the collaboration is the establishment of media equipment check-out, which originated in the College Library computer lab. The library provided extensive knowledge of processes and policies around loaning materials and the first laptop check-out program on campus began in College Library. The success of the program coupled with the high demand for laptops positioned the libraries to help make laptop check-out available in other campus computer labs, even those not located in libraries. Library technology staff ended up creating the equipment check-out system used by all laptop loaning locations because the library's Integrated Library System (at the time, Voyager) would not work in non-library computer labs. This is a clear example of the creation of new services resulting from a collaborative partnership.

Staffing the computer lab is also collaborative. Student employees staff the help desk every hour the library is open. Library permanent staff that are information technology professionals, supervise the help desk student staff, with the student staff funding primarily covered by the library budget. The operations of the computer lab are managed by library staff, who also participate in the computer lab managers group meetings and share experiences and solutions across campus computer labs. Most policies are driven by campus information technology, such as the official "Appropriate Use of Information Technology" policy that governs student use of technology no matter what environment. Another identifying factor
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about this collaborative partnership is that it is often difficult to differentiate between which computer lab services originated from campus computing services and which from library services.

The recent renovation of the computer lab to include space for two significant collaborative partnerships, the Media Studio classrooms and DesignLab, is another example of the evolution of the computer lab as a center of collaboration in the library.

DesignLab

In 2011, the libraries agreed to provide support for an initiative to create DesignLab, a service that provides consultations on the composition, design, and aesthetics of digital media projects. The initiative had broad campus support in identifying a need for such a service and was driven by a faculty member associated with various Digital Humanities projects. The library support came from offering space for the service and being an administrative home for the initiative. Funding is managed by the library financial staff and the Associate Director position is housed in the library and is a library employee. The faculty director position, however, is held by a faculty member who is employed in his home department. The collaborative nature of this partnership includes the full integration of DesignLab space into the library’s computer lab, hiring and managing the Associate Director position, human resources and budget support, and library presence on the Advisory Board.

The technology support is from the collaborative library/computer lab model described above. Hardware and software are provided through campus computing and the student technology fee, and staff support, both from professional information technology staff and student help desk staff, is provided by the library. DesignLab services are offered certain hours during the semester, and the space is available for general use during all other hours the library is open. The physical space was designed by both library and DesignLab staff to meet the needs of both the DesignLab services and library/computer lab use (see Figure 3). Because the service is primarily one of consultations, the workstations are designed to seat small groups of people. Outside of DesignLab hours, these same workstations provide use of computers for group projects.

DesignLab is a campus-wide service that employs Teaching Assistants from multiple departments on campus, across different Schools and Colleges. The funding model is complex, as is the administrative structure. The Libraries were chosen as an administrative home in part because of the "neutral" role Libraries have, serving the entire campus. The collaboration with the Libraries also gives DesignLab a clear service message of being open to any student in any department, by virtue of not being established in any one department, School or College.

This example of collaboration demonstrates the multiple layers such a partnership involves: shared staffing, development and promotion of services, shared vision and design of space, and governance, including discussions of how the services and spaces might evolve over time. The layers have complexity that can create tensions (for example between meeting the operational needs of the core service with the outreach and growth agenda of the Faculty Director) that can be expected in highly integrated collaborations. In such cases, the shared benefits of the partnership can be reviewed and confirmed to ensure that all partners can move the vision forward to meet each partner’s goals.

Another benefit of this collaboration is the adjacency of services into which DesignLab fits. The remodeling of the computer lab in 2012 not only added DesignLab space, but also created the Media Studio-classrooms. The Media Studios allow for semester-long courses that involve collaborative digital projects to be supported by flexible room set-up and high-end media equipment. DesignLab is located directly adjacent to the Media Studios and across from the computer lab help desk. In addition to the software training classroom mentioned above, the computer lab offers a collection of computer and software manuals, a large and varied equipment check-out service, and help desk staff that provides point-of-need assistance at all hours. The computer lab therefore provides a suite of services supporting different ways students might interact with a digital media assignment.

For example, a student might be in a class in the Media Studios where an assignment such as the creation of a video occurs. The project may involve the student needing to learn more about video editing software. The student could take a software training class in the hands-on training classroom. Then the student might need additional details and choose to check out a book about that software. The project may require a video camera at a higher quality than the student has available so she checks out a camera from the equipment check-out service. She uses the computers in the lab to work on the project and then needs some additional help with the design, and schedules a consultation in DesignLab. The 24-hour library allows the student to work on the project whenever it’s most convenient, and she can get point-of-need assistance from the in-person help desk staff at all hours the library is open. Finally, perhaps she wants to schedule a viewing of the final video, so she checks out a projector and screen. While not all the components of these services are in direct collaboration with each other, the library is in partnership with each of them and provides a unified space to connect multiple services in support of the life cycle of student experience with digital media.

WisCEL

The Wisconsin Collaboratory for Enhanced Learning (WisCEL) was developed in 2011 and has two separate spaces in two different UW-Madison Libraries. College Library is home to one WisCEL Center, and Wendt Commons Library (the engineering library) hosts the other Center. These spaces were conceived of and designed together, each meeting the same goals of the instructional needs, while achieving some design differences to meet the individual differences in library cultures and uses. WisCEL was created as a campus initiative to support active learning, especially in large, gateway courses that take advantage of a blended or flipped classroom approach to teaching (see Figure 4).
The WisCEL Centers are flexible learning environments coupled with appropriate technologies that support both peer-collaboration and self-paced learning. They are spaces that allow instructors to try new methods and pedagogical approaches. WisCEL courses employ software that provides immediate feedback to students on assignments and exams, and allows increased instructor time with students. Similar to DesignLab, there is a Faculty Director of WisCEL who has an appointment in his home department, and an Associate Director position that is administratively housed in the libraries. Also, the library provides staffing for the WisCEL help desks and information technology professionals support and maintain the technology infrastructure.

The WisCEL Centers have priority scheduling for academic instruction during weekday daytime hours and are open for general student use evenings and weekends. This collaboration is also complex and there are additional outside partners from the Schools and Colleges. The Advisory Board includes library staff and discussions about overall direction and vision for WisCEL involves libraries. The design of the space was done with libraries at the table to ensure that the spaces would meet not only the instructional goals, but also the library study space needs. For example, the use of glass walls to delineate break-out rooms was necessary both to the aesthetics of the library as well as behavior management for security.

The provision of active learning spaces is a growing need on university campuses. For the campus to have created such spaces in buildings that are not libraries, or as a new building unto itself, what benefits of the collaboration would be lost? There are some smaller active learning classrooms that were developed after the WisCEL Centers opened modeled on the successful design of WisCEL. Therefore, there is evidence of this kind of non-collaborative approach. While not offering the same scale of size, these classrooms also have little technology support and no staff presence that allows them to be used outside of course instruction. The rooms sit empty between classes and are locked in the evening because the technology needs to be kept secure. However, with WisCEL, the library's hours and staffing can fully leverage access, security, and support for the spaces. There are already technology support staff and security staff in the building. The library has capacity during the day to accommodate the use by classes, and classes don't meet at night, which is the time the library needs to offer as much study space as possible. The collaboration offers a lovely vision of integration of formal and informal learning. Even without that vision, there are simply practical support reasons for this collaboration to exist.

WisCEL has been identified as a success story on the UW-Madison campus, earning a Teaching & Learning Innovation Award in 2014. Not only are the instructional goals being met, as proven through assessment of student learning, but campus officials also cite the partnership with libraries as a model of efficient use of space. WisCEL leverages the existing infrastructure of the libraries for technology support, security, staffing and facility maintenance, and the 24-hour use of the space showcases sustainable practices in space usage. The collaboration is evident through the joint planning, shared vision, and governance of WisCEL as campus looks to expand opportunities for other WisCEL spaces.

PARTNERSHIP CONTINUUM

The examples shared thus far are those where the level of partnership has been the same throughout the existence of the relationship. It is also possible for levels to evolve over time. One example of this evolution is the student peer-tutoring service at UW-Madison. The Greater University Tutoring Service (GUTS) is a student-run organization that provides many different types of tutoring. The “drop-in” tutoring service has been located in College Library since the 1980's. For several decades, GUTS had a small space that was very simply defined by a couple of room dividers around a few study tables in the corner of a popular talking area on the second floor of the library. GUTS posted their hours in the space and anytime they were not using the space for tutoring, it was available for open study. This co-location worked fairly well for many years. The one problem was when a tutor did not show up for an expected shift, students would often come down to the first floor information desk to ask library staff if or when the tutor would arrive. Library staff had no information about the service, other than the standard schedule, and was unable to answer detailed questions about GUTS.

A 2009 remodeling project that involved the space on the first floor, near the information desk, allowed an opportunity to rethink not only the location of the GUTS drop-in tutoring service, but also the level of involvement between GUTS and the library. The library was able to offer a more visible location, which was of great benefit to GUTS, as well as adjacency to the information desk. The library provided new furniture and signage as part of the remodeling project and explored ways to be more directly involved in ensuring that the tutoring service was run as well as possible (see Figure 5). Because students primarily run GUTS, the library was able to offer some additional perspectives on ways to improve service, especially when it came to information about available tutors. The tutoring schedules were integrated into the library events scheduling system and displayed on the events monitor. Tutors began checking in at the information desk before their shifts, allowing library staff to be regularly aware of tutor availability and enabling more consistent communication between library staff and GUTS staff. Another benefit was that GUTS began participating in the library’s end-of-semester support for the exam period, creating a “Study Day Event” that provided extra tutoring, along with treats, on the preparatory day before final exams. The partnership clearly evolved from co-location into cooperation.

By understanding that a partnership can evolve, an important thing for libraries to consider is what kind of partnership do you want to achieve? The partnership levels do not simply need to “happen” by the nature of how they are established. One important lesson from understanding the framework of the different levels of partnerships is that you can assess the factors of the relationship with a partner and determine not only at what level you are operating, but also what level would be ideal. By looking at the various factors along a continuum, you can identify goals for each partnership based on those factors, as well as identify actions that can move the partnership towards the relationship that you want.
ISSUES, CONTROVERSIES, PROBLEMS

Relationship Factors

Entering into a partnership relationship necessarily means that various operational, administrative and managerial factors will need to change to take into account the fact that this is a partnership rather than units working on their own. The farther along the continuum to a fully collaborative partnership, the more complex the challenges of meeting each unit’s needs are. Organizational factors including communication, budgeting, governance, decision-making, and identity all have to adapt for each partner’s needs to be met.

In many cases, issues between partners need to be negotiated and accommodated through formal agreements that arise after conflicts have required resolution. Initial agreements and understandings often do not address the matters that come up after operations have been underway and the partners encounter unanticipated situations of different perspectives on priorities. The more complex the relationship, often occurring at the collaboration level, the more necessary a formal outline of responsibilities and expectations is required. See Appendices 1 and 2 for examples of such agreements for UW-Madison College Library partnerships.

More importantly, libraries involved in partnerships should consider not only what agreements may be necessary for both parties, but also look at specific relationship factors to identify opportunities to achieve an optimal level of partnership.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A savvy manager can shift a relationship along the partnership continuum by making changes within these factors. Awareness of these factors, and understanding how these factors change as one moves along the continuum allows managers to effectively develop and maintain the relationship.

Communication, Knowledge Sharing

Communication and knowledge-sharing in a co-location relationship will typically be infrequent and involve only the most necessary information like operating hours or announcements of changes in services. Sharing only the minimum amount of information is adequate because one partner’s decisions either don’t impact the other partner, or there is no joint decision making so the need is simply to communicate a decision.

A collaboration-based partnership will need to communicate at a higher level, not just sharing information about operations or hours, but also communicating goals and vision. A good way to test if your partnership is operating at a collaborative level is to ask one partner’s front-line staff a question about the other partner’s operation. A truly collaborative relationship ensures that all support staff are fully aware of their partner’s services and can answer questions about them.

To ensure a healthy collaborative partnership, include the partners on your email lists and invite them to your staff meetings. Participation in your vision and goal discussions will promote a more collaborative environment as well.

Cost Sharing, Budgeting

In a co-located operation, costs are strongly separated. Partners might not even have any knowledge of the costs of the other’s operation and decisions on how money is spent are done in isolation. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) might not even be necessary because the boundaries between cost centers are stark and obvious.

Figure 6. Communication, knowledge sharing

- Only at time of need
- Infrequent
- Only share the most basic info
- Typical desk staff response: “I don’t know…”
- Constant communication
- Shared email lists
- Shared goals & vision
- Desk staff trained & fully aware
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Figure 7. Cost sharing, budgeting

- Partner follows operational rules of the Library
- Operations managed by Library
- Standard roles for staff
- Wider variety of services available to users
- Partner can manage operation
- Library may adjust or create policies to assist
- More varied roles for staff
- More efficient

In a fully collaborative environment, budgets can be much more complex. Negotiations occur frequently and funding could flow from either partner to the other, depending on the nature of the relationship. Funding could be combined into one account center, or there could be complex agreements about which partner pays for what. As new expenses arise, it is not always clear who should be paying for what, in particular when the partners have strongly shared goals. Purchases or services can provide benefit to both partners, so not only might there be negotiations as to who pays, but there could be negotiations around how much each partner gets to use the purchase.

Finally, while an MOU is probably a necessity in a collaborative partnership, funding and expenses can get complicated quickly and require frequent updates to the MOU. A more collaborative relationship can result by discussing budget issues together, looking for shared solutions to funding problems. These budget relationships can lead to more efficient operations as the partners could centralize some shared costs.

Governance, Goal Setting, Decision Making

In a co-located partnership, shared goals are aligned at only a basic level. In fact, the only shared goal might be providing service to the same audience. For example, a cafe located in a library has a goal of providing a service to a clientele, but most likely has a larger goal of generating a profit. The cafe’s partner, the library, has a similar goal of serving that audience, but the higher goal is access to information.

Decisions for one partner are made without regard to the other partner’s needs, and in the rare case that those decisions actually impact the other partner (e.g. building hours) frequently one partner makes the decision and the other partner has to live with that decision. Governance occurs separately as well within a co-location partnership whereas in a collaborative relationship, partners will actively participate in the other’s governance committees.

In a collaborative partnership, decision making can be accomplished together as both partners have similar goals or even shared goals, with outcomes supporting both partners’ vision. To move a relationship to one that is more collaborative, consider inviting partners to serve on your governance committees, or participate in goal-setting exercises. In addition, consider sitting in on the partner’s goals discussions, looking for opportunities to assist in their achievements.

Identity and Community

Partners that are co-located have their own unique identities, completely separate from each other. The products or services they provide are not necessarily related, nor might they even serve the same audience. Promotions, campaigns and marketing are not coordinated because of these differences.

In a collaborative partnership, the identities of the partners might be so intertwined that the audience does not even know they aren’t being served by the same department. Events and promotions could be closely tied together, coordinated or combined into the same event. In a more collaborative relationship, the types of space provided may need to be more varied or flexible, allowing for a diversity of uses depending on which partner is using the space for service.

Space and Boundaries

In a co-location relationship, the space set aside for the partner is typically well-defined, perhaps even physically separated from other library spaces. In fact, their space could be so separate that they can set operating hours on their own, independent of the other partner, as they can either close their space without an impact on the other services, or they have a separate entrance entirely.

Figure 8. Governance, goal setting, decision making

- No overlap in costs
- Clear boundaries where costs start & end
- Each group responsible for own needs
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- Needs can be covered by either group
- MOU outlines expectations

Figure 9. Identity and community

- No overlap in costs
- Clear boundaries where costs start & end
- Each group responsible for own needs
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- MOU outlines expectations
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Figure 10. Space and boundaries

- Space defined by library
- Spaces are limited physically and functionally
- Spaces could be isolated
- Diversity of spaces meet variety of on-demand needs
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- Public events include both partners
- Staff events include both partners
- Promotions are shared
- If one leaves, the other may not continue

The definition of space can also apply to the services provided, in that their services could be limited to the boundaries of their own defined area. Spaces and service boundaries in a collaborative relationship are going to overlap, perhaps with different partners providing services in the same space at the same time, or even to the same customer at the same time if the partners have completely co-mingled their service models. For a more collaborative relationship, look for ways to overlap the physical and service spaces. Providing partner space closer to the main service areas will offer greater opportunities for staff to learn about each other’s services, and will provide better opportunities for users to be exposed to them.

Operations

Operations can include the policies in place for the facility, the supervisory structure, and the service model. In a co-location model, the partners may not have any reason to overlap these roles, as the space, decision-making and service can be wholly separate from each other.
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A collaborative operation tends to have policies and services that are shaped by all partners’ needs. In fact, services might even be offered or supported by either partner interchangeably. Staff roles in a co-located partnership are going to be more typical, in that they will support the service that is associated with their position, whereas in a collaborative model, staff need broader training so that they can offer assistance and answer questions about partner services.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The authors are interested to learn if using these specific partnership levels will indeed help institutions assess their own co-located, cooperative and collaborative services and resources. There is not much literature at this time with that specific assessment of partnership levels, although partnerships are being written about in case studies. For example, the Library/Writing Center collaboration is detailed by Giglio and Strickland (2005) with specific attention to what defines collaboration as distinct from cooperation. They write that “collaboration is best defined by the actions, or more specifically, the motivation behind the actions of the participants. It is letting go of territoriality and self-interest to share the load and make sacrifices, when necessary, for the common good” (p. 142). If the Lippincott framework for the three partnership levels is useful, more specific examples of such distinctions will be available, and thus continue to help libraries be more intentional in seeking or refining relationships with other campus entities.

More importantly, understanding the benefits of partnerships can help libraries better understand their role within our institutions and help guide the library through the changing landscape of higher education. As libraries are seen as providing space solutions to active learning classrooms, will that improve libraries’ position as partners in the teaching and learning mission of our academic institutions? Are these collaborative partnerships becoming more important in the role of libraries? Also, there is much work to be done regarding assessment of the partnerships and shared spaces. Assessment activity is often uneven. For example, there has been extensive assessment of student learning outcomes in WisCEL courses, but little work to explore the effectiveness of the informal learning space as used outside of formal classes. Another area for research is the role of collaborative design for learning spaces in libraries. Somerville and Collins (2008) explore a collaborative design approach to library planning and explain: “learner-centered and highly interactive, collaborative design is both a philosophy and a process in which the needs, wants and limitations of end users play a central role at each stage of the design process” (p. 808). Can a collaborative partnership go beyond the primary institutional partners to include the users? At UW-Madison, having librarians at the design table for WisCEL allowed for space considerations that met both instructional and library needs. What was missing? The learners themselves were not part of the design process. Now that large-scale active learning spaces have been in place for several years, how can students who are using such spaces, both for formal and informal learning, inform design and be a meaningful part of the collaboration?

It is also important to consider the effect of integrating new social and instructional spaces on the traditional role of libraries to provide space for quiet and/or solitary study. Jeff Gayton (2008) defines the communal nature of academic libraries as offering space for quiet study in opposition to the growing social model for libraries that integrates classrooms, cafés, and collaborative study space (p. 60). He argues that “it is vital that the new be reconciled with the old; that new functions serve the needs of academic library users and that new services do not detract from existing, and valued ones” (p. 64). As academic libraries continue to build partnerships and repurpose space to accommodate an ever-growing expansion
of the role of libraries within universities, how does the traditional role of library space continue to be valued and understood? Again, assessment of partnerships between these two contexts is key to understanding the impact of the library’s role on campus.

CONCLUSION

One of the primary benefits of the collaborative partnerships at UW-Madison is that they have brought a higher level of campus administrative attention to libraries. For example, the academic success of WSICEL in terms of the improved student learning outcomes, combined with the effective and efficient use of space by building active learning classrooms in the libraries, establishes the library as aligned with institutional goals. The new strategic framework for the University of Wisconsin-Madison (Blank & Mangelsdorff, 2015) includes a goal to "transform library structures and technologies to best support research and learning, and to attain campus efficiencies."

Another benefit for UW-Madison libraries is that several of the collaborations have resulted in remodeled spaces that would not have been funded without the partnership. College Library’s WSICEL Center remodeling project turned an underutilized silent study room full of individual carrels into a beautiful, modern space with a variety of seating configurations and technology options that found an immediate audience as popular study space. While the primary goal to create an active learning space was also met and has achieved great success, the value to the library in improving the quality of that space is a major advantage as well.

By adding DesignLab to the computer lab space, the workstations designed to allow consultations also serve as open workstations that support group work during hours DesignLab is not offering services. The computer lab therefore benefits from the presence of DesignLab (and remodeling funds) by providing an efficient solution to an identified need: giving students group workspace rather than offering only rows of computers for individual work. A library need was met through the opportunity that the collaborative partnership allowed, both in terms of service provision and funding for space renovations.

The partnership with College Library and the Media Studios is definitely another success story. The classrooms serve semester-long academic courses and offer space for a number of one-time events such as workshops, seminars, and presentations, in addition to increasing the variety of collaborative study spaces with technology that support assignments in digital media. These newly renovated, technology-rich classroom spaces that also provide flexible use for many different functions, including open student use, is a great benefit to the library beyond the initial classroom needs being met.

Here is a summary of the perceived benefits for libraries to leverage collaborative partnerships in their spaces:

- **Innovation:** Administration sees libraries as innovative and willing to work with others.
- **Visibility:** There is increased visibility for the libraries through partnerships.
- **Faculty Involvement:** Instructional spaces in the library bring faculty into the library.
- **Advocacy:** There are greater numbers of advocates for the library through collaborative relationships and expanded constituencies.
- **Instruction:** Faculty and instructional staff see libraries and librarians as partners in the teaching and learning mission.
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KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

Co-Location: The inclusion of non-library services within a library managed space for the convenience of users. Library manages the facility or space. Non-library partner manages the service. Audience is shared.

Collaboration: Library and non-library managers and administrators work together to develop shared goals and plan for new and re-envisioned services and spaces. Library and non-library partners work together to manage facilities and services.

Cooperation: Library and non-library administrators, managers, and service providers work together to jointly plan for and improve non-library services offered within a library managed facility or space. Library manages the facility or space. Library and non-library partner work together to plan for and improve non-library services. Non-library partner manages the service.

DesignLab: A service at the UW-Madison that offers one-on-one consultations with students to provide guidance on producing and presenting well-designed posters, videos, animations or other digital media.

GUTS: The Greater University Tutors Service is a peer-tutoring program at UW-Madison that is student-run and provides both drop-in tutoring in the library and other coordinated tutoring services.

Media Studios: Classrooms in the UW-Madison College Library computer lab that allow for semester-long courses involving collaborative digital projects to be supported by flexible room set-up and high-end media equipment.

WisCEL: The Wisconsin Collaboratory for Enhanced Learning is an initiative to support active learning at UW-Madison. WisCEL offers support for innovative course design combined with technology-enhanced learning spaces that foster collaborative student work.

APPENDIX 1

Sample sections of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between WisCEL and the UW-Madison General Library System:

Wisconsin Collaboratory for Enhanced Learning (WisCEL) Project Memorandum of Understanding and Agreement

This agreement shall be annually reviewed by signature parties and renewed by June 30th of each year. Annual review and renewal will be initiated by WisCEL.

About WisCEL

Wisconsin Collaboratory for Enhanced Learning (WisCEL) is a faculty-led initiative that challenges traditional ideas about effective instructional models, course design, and learning spaces and provides support for institution-wide learning improvement.

Leveraging partnerships throughout the University, WisCEL facilitates the creation of ultra-flexible, technology-enhanced learning environments and provides the operational, instructional, and technical personnel and support that faculty need in order to affect real change in today’s classroom. WisCEL learning environments are located in spaces primarily used by UW-Madison undergraduates and WisCEL courses are chosen for the program based on their impact on undergraduate learning.

Administration, Accountability and Funding

WisCEL is an independent project that began as a proposal to the Madison Initiative for Undergraduates (MIU). WisCEL is funded through a combination of support from MIU and the Student Information Technology Initiative (SITI). Under the direction of the WisCEL Director and Associate Director, WisCEL is accountable to and reports annually on project impact through the MIU process.

In order to maintain a broad perspective, WisCEL meets twice annually with an advisory group. The group assists WisCEL leadership by providing objective advice from a variety of perspectives on directions that will help WisCEL further its overall vision. The advisory group may also appoint working groups to help address issues specific to WisCEL. Both Wendt Commons and GLS will hold membership seats on the WisCEL Advisory Committee and will participate in outreach and informational communication when appropriate to order to promote WisCEL and the library/WisCEL partnership.

Though WisCEL will remain an independent project, the General Library System (GLS) has agreed to host the WisCEL budget and WisCEL staff positions administratively and Wendt Commons agrees to provide office space for the WisCEL Associate Director and staff. WisCEL office space is located adjacent to the Wendt Commons WisCEL Center in rooms 409 and 411.

Facilities/Scheduling

Event Management Systems (EMS) software will be used as a scheduling tool for both WisCEL Centers unless a change is agreed upon.
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Scheduling for WisCEL course activity is typically between 7:30 a.m. through 5:30 p.m. Monday through Friday during the Spring and Fall semesters and between 9:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. during the summer sessions and excludes exam weeks. Every formal course or discussion section, regardless of daytime of the class, will be vetted through the WisCEL proposal submission process. A caveat is for instructors who request to use the space for only a few class sessions of their course. These requests can be granted by the facility manager (College Library or Wendt Commons) provided 1) the semester in which the request takes place has begun and 2) the facility manager and WisCEL agree it is an acceptable use of the space and 3) the space is available and the activity will not disrupt existing course activities.

After the start of each semester, events other than WisCEL course activities can be scheduled during the “WisCEL” hours at the discretion of the facility managers (College Library and Wendt Commons), provided these activities are not regularly occurring class sessions (these should all go through the proposal process).

WisCEL courses and related course activities will be entered into EMS by WisCEL staff. Non-WisCEL activities will be entered into EMS by facility managers.

Consistent and respectful communication will occur between WisCEL and WisCEL Center facility managers so that all parties are aware of what is being scheduled, where, and when.

Communication will usually occur by e-mail and generic e-mail lists will be used so that all appropriate parties are notified.

Issue Resolution

As with any partnership, situations may arise that are not yet covered in this document. If/when these issues arise and an acceptable solution cannot be reached through collaborative discussion, all parties agree to turn to the WisCEL Advisory Group, which holds representation from the Provost’s Office, Wendt Commons, College Library, OLS, WisCEL, and outside representatives, for issue resolution assistance.

APPENDIX 2

Sample sections of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the UW-Madison Digital Studies program and the UW-Madison General Library System:

Memo of Understanding between Digital Studies and Libraries Concerning College Library Media Studios A and B (2252A and 2252B)

The primary purpose of the Media Studio classrooms is to support semester long courses that integrate collaborative digital projects into the curriculum. Digital Studies Certificate timetable courses will be given priority in 2252A, provided these courses adhere to deadlines determined by the Associate Director of DesignLab in conjunction with deadlines set by the Registrar.
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Media-rich courses that are not associated with the Digital Studies Certificate will be given priority in 2252B, provided these courses adhere to deadlines determined by the Associate Director of DesignLab in conjunction with deadlines set by the Registrar.

The Associate Director of the DesignLab has final decision-making authority in scheduling the use of Media Studio classrooms for timetable courses (primary use). The Director of the Digital Studies Certificate and the Associate Director of the DesignLab will work together to coordinate the use of the Media Studio classrooms for large courses and resolve any conflicts in scheduling requests.

The secondary purpose is to provide open collaborative and individual spaces for students to use when the Media Studio isn’t being used for its primary purpose.

Tertiary uses of the Media Studio are considered and evaluated based on three criteria:

How individual requests align with the overall purpose of the Media Studio.

Whether individual requests are a good fit for the technology and resources available within the Media Studio space (i.e. is the request a good fit with a space which provides a media rich environment that emphasizes collaborative learning).

Whether the request is for a time that competes with either the primary or secondary purpose of the Media Studio.

Tertiary uses will not be scheduled until after primary uses have been scheduled. In practice, this means that tertiary uses will typically be scheduled after the second week of a semester or session.

The Assistant Director of College Library has final decision making authority in scheduling the use of the Media Studio classrooms for non-timetable courses, workshops, etc. (tertiary use).

Scheduling

Room scheduling will be input into the calendar system used by the library. In addition, the Associate Director of the DesignLab works with the Office of the Registrar so that timetable courses in Media Studio classrooms are listed in the University Course Guide.

Data about the number and types of courses using the Media Studio courses will be collected and maintained by the Associate Director of the DesignLab.

Funding

The creation of the Media Studio classrooms was partially funded by Digital Studies Certificate Program ($100K/2252A) with the rest of the funds coming from the General Library System. The current Media Studios classroom (2252A/2252B) replaced a Media Studio pilot, which used 2191E.

Computers and software are the property of the DotIT InfoLabs and managed by College Library. Projectors and other hardware are the property of College Library. Media Studio technology specifications will be made available on the College Library Website.

Support

Point of need tech support is provided by College Library Computer & Media Center staff, including student consultants at the help desk and College Library CMC permanent staff.
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- Level 1 support (student consultants) is available 24 hours.
- Level 2 support (permanent IT staff) is available 8am-5pm Monday – Friday.

Any technology needs beyond standard installations will need to be approved by the College Library Computer & Media Center (CMC) before the class is scheduled.

The Associate Director of DesignLab is a staff member of General Library System. This Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) is valid through May of 2016 and should be reviewed for updates and continuance at that time or unless substantial changes take place and renegotiation becomes necessary.
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ABSTRACT

This chapter describes the evolution of the University of New Hampshire (UNH) Manchester Research Mentor Program, a cross-campus collaboration that trains writing tutors to assist students with information literacy skills. The first half of the chapter documents the first iteration of the Research Mentor Program, describing the recruitment, training, tutoring activities, and evaluation of the writing tutors/research mentors; the integration of the research mentors in First-Year Writing classroom library instruction sessions and writing tutorials; and the results of a three-semester evaluation study of the program’s effectiveness at teaching composition students the information skills they will need to develop as writers, researchers, and critical thinkers. The second half of the chapter describes the Research Mentor Program’s transformation as librarians, learning center staff, and classroom instructors adapted the program’s goals by integrating the vision of the Association of College and Research Libraries’ Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education into their pedagogy.

INTRODUCTION

To help students develop the information literacy and writing skills essential for college-level learning, members of the University of New Hampshire at Manchester’s academic community have collaborated to enhance those skills. The Research Mentor Program, an alliance between the UNH Manchester Library and the Center for Academic Enrichment (CAE), integrates the services of library and learning
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ITEMS DISCUSSED
I. OVERVIEW
A. These minutes cover the Charrette from Wed, Jan 16, 2019
B. The first hour featured a full campus activity to gather information from students and faculty regarding the TLC and the Library.
C. The next two hours featured a more focused charrette with the Library, the TLC, and some invited stakeholders for each group. This was the first time bringing these two groups together to discuss their shared programs.

II. FULL-CAMPUS
A. All students and faculty at UWT were invited for pizza and to contribute their opinions on various questions about the library and the TLC. This was held on the ground floor of TPS.
B. There were (6) total boards that inquired about entry to the SNO/TLB buildings, what kinds of study spaces students prefer, and any additional comments faculty or students might have.
C. Board 1:

D. Board 2:
E. Board 3:

WHAT IS YOUR COLLABORATIVE STUDY STYLE?

LOUNGE  MEDIASCAPE  OPEN GROUP ROOM  SEMI-PRIVATE  PRIVATE STUDY ROOM

F. Board 4:

HOW DO YOU STUDY ALONE ON CAMPUS?

TRADITIONAL TABLE  STUDY CARREL  SOLO LOUNGE  TRAIN STYLE  ENCLOSED TECH POD
G. Board 5:

H. Board 6:
I. All boards will be up in TLB and SNO over the course of the next two weeks in order to get more information from students who pass through but could not make it to the charrette.

III. LIBRARY-TLC CHARRETTE
   A. Intro & welcome by Chancellor Pagano.
   B. Recap of Library Site Visits to Odegaard (UW Seattle) and Pierce College Library (Fort Steilacoom Campus.)
      a. Likes –
         i. single entry & initial awareness of all programs upon entry where the key programs were easy to spot and wayfinding/signage was integrated and helpful
         ii. welcoming and comfortable spaces
         iii. ability to self-select study spaces
      b. Dislikes
         i. Writing centers in both libraries visited seemed very small
         ii. Odegaard may not use space as well as possible, but they are one of 14 libraries serving the students at UW Seattle
      c. Lessons Learned
         i. Need to find the right balance of quiet and study spaces
         ii. UWT serves everyone and needs to use space carefully & thoughtfully
         iii. As UWT is a commuter campus, the library and the TLC may be the only two programs that are a shared experience for all students. How can these programs have spaces to compound this?
         iv. The library needs to support campus community with space to display and have events.
   C. Block Diagrams
      a. McG showed initial block diagrams for TLB & SNO based on the programs that each unit has been exploring in previous meetings. These block diagrams are for conversation purposes only to have a jumping off point to discuss ideas. Block diagrams attached.
      b. The initial discussion took a step back from the TLC & Library specific programming to ask if campus-wide the programs scoped (TLC, Library, CEI, Veterans Programs, OR, & and event space) are the right programs for these two buildings.
      c. Secondly, we discussed the adjacencies and programming shown in the block diagrams.
      d. Comments from the two discussions:
e. The consensus for TLB at the end of the charrette was that the circulation desk (with processing, offices, reserves, quick use computers), research help desk (with offices, grad student work stations, consultation room, research tutoring computers, non-profit station) should be located on the first floor. No collection stacks need to be on the first floor. Research can be collocated with writing but that is a future internal discussion.

f. All agreed that SNO needs a welcome/concierge desk since everyone enters this building seeking help about all campus buildings.

g. More comments to be collected over the next few weeks as library & TLC studies the diagrams more closely. A list of questions from McG will be developed.

III. NEXT STEPS

A. McG to send out block diagrams & questions for further study and commenting by the library and TLC

B. Next meetings:
   a. Unit leadership to meet & discuss logistics of collocating
   b. McG to meet with each unit again in Feb.