

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035-30
Date: November 29th, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.
Reich+Petch Architects Inc.
Novita Techne

Re: **Project Overview – Stakeholder Consultation**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Project Overview for Queen's Stakeholders	
2	OWNER PROJECT OVERVIEW	
	Martha Whitehead, University Librarian presented a succinct overview of the Library and Archives Library Master Plan project to a large enthusiastic crowd, noting the following:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The composition of the Queen's Library and Archives Master Plan Steering Group▪ The importance of planning for Queen's Library and Archives of the future▪ The role of the library to inspire learning and spark creativity▪ The uniqueness of each of the libraries and archives and the 'feeling of knowledge' in these spaces▪ The dramatic changes in information technology with the 'world at your finger tips'▪ The new demands on space; for example, more enquiry based learning▪ The burgeoning demand for study group spaces and spaces for services	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The importance of all Queen's stakeholders participating in the process▪ The dovetailing of the Library & Archives Master Plan process with the concurrent Campus Master Plan process▪ The significant of retaining an expert consultant team to facilitate the Master Plan process; consultants with expertise in Master Planning, Library Planning, Archival Planning and sub-consultants with a broad range of expertise	
3	<p>CONSULTANT PRESENTATION</p> <p>Architect presented a PowerPoint presentation introducing stakeholders to the Project Team and planning process, noting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Project Team Architect introduced the project team.<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Client - Queen's University – Library and Archives▪ Prime Consultant - CS&P Architects Inc. - Paul Cravit - Design Principal in Charge, Susan Lewin – Back-up Principal, Suzanne Cooke Wooland – Project Architect▪ Collections Specialist – Reich + Petch – Stephen Petri▪ Library Planning Specialist – Aaron Cohen Associates – Alex Cohen▪ Structural Consultant – Halsall Associates Ltd.▪ Mechanical/Electrical/IT Consultant - HH Angus & Associates Ltd.▪ Cost Consultant – tcm2r▪ Heritage Consultant – ERA Architects Inc.▪ AV Consultant – Novita Techne▪ Consultant Team Experience Consultants presented images of completed relevant work.▪ Key Issues/Opportunities/Goals Key issues, opportunities and goals proposed for the master plan process were identified:<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Listening, engaging, and collaborating with all Queen's stakeholders	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Careful structuring of the master plan process, including service plans, functional relationship analysis, space needs assessment, concept design options, and review of space uses▪ Appreciating the intrinsic value of collections▪ Recognizing changing technologies▪ Creating robust, nimble, and adaptive spaces▪ Exploiting daylight and views for interactive spaces▪ Maximizing group study rooms▪ Maximizing individual quiet study areas▪ Focus on furniture - mobile and flexible▪ Reconciling challenges of existing facilities▪ Incorporating innovative practices▪ Capitalizing on campus plan synergies	
	Architect ended presentation with Principal's Message: <i>"Queen's remains a vital, and a great, university because it has...been prepared to adapt and transform in the face of changing circumstances while preserving its core values. We rightly celebrate our past and we should use it to light our path ahead, but never allow it to become a heavy burden that impedes our progress."</i>	

Prepared by: CS&P Architects Inc.

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035.30
Date: November 30, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – Undergraduate Students**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Undergraduate Student Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW	
	Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session:	
	Questions:	
	1. Existing Facilities – Queen’s Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses	
	What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan?	
	2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future	
	The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen’s Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

	ITEM	ACTION
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments: Medical Student (Bracken Library) 3.1 Bracken Library group rooms great.(rooms #124 & 126) 3.2 Librarians at Bracken Library excellent. 3.3 Peer tutoring at library very successful. Kinesiology Student 3.4 Harry Potter Room in Douglas Library preferred space for study. 3.5 Stauffer Library First Floor good for group work. Education Student 3.6 Education Library heavily used by 5 th Year Education students, but only during the four month instruction period. Nursing Student 3.7 Nursing students do a lot of group work. ILC (Integrated Learning Centre, 3 stories of study rooms) at Beamish-Munro Hall is a good, heavily used area. Rooms include table, chairs, and a whiteboard. 3.8 Easy to find space in Law Library. 3.9 Library stacks act as acoustic barriers, allowing quiet, independent carrel study. 3.10 Books create an ambiance one expects in a library. Economics Student 3.11 Stauffer Library has the best ambiance. Basement level is quiet, natural light, and plenty of electrical outlets. 3.12 Stauffer Library operating hours good, reflecting student's schedule.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments: Medical Student (Bracken Library) 4.1 Spaces poor for quiet individual study. Basement requires more space for	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

ITEM	ACTION
quiet study.	
4.2 Classroom in Bracken with laptops – empty. No one using laptops. (attached to desks)	
4.3 Peer tutoring at library very successful.	
Kinesiology Student	
4.4 Stauffer Library does not have enough couches to promote group work. Library should offer more options for group work.	
4.5 Stauffer Library does not have enough desks. Desks at a premium at exam time.	
4.6 More electrical outlets are required.	
Education Student	
4.7 Education Library seldom used by Education students during undergraduate studies. During years 1 to 3 student had 1 class on west campus.	
4.8 Education Library empty while 5 th Year Education students are on their practicums.	
Nursing Student	
4.9 Stauffer and Douglas Libraries too busy, not enough study rooms. Nurses competing with Arts students and first year students at Stauffer Library.	
Economics Student	
4.10 Law Library space too crammed.	
4.11 Stauffer Library has poor cell phone service at basement level. Stauffer has insufficient number of group study rooms, booking a room is impossible. (maximum allowable time – 20 hours/student/semester – not sufficient)	
4.12 Website - one student noted that Queen's website was not very good, very clumsy. Google Book Search preferred option to access material and create bibliographies.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

	ITEM	ACTION
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments: 5.1 More group study space in Stauffer Library. (Ground Floor) 5.2 Increased visibility of librarians. (Stauffer Library) 5.3 Integrate cafe into library. 5.4 Introduce a digital seat counter in each library for easy assessment of seat availability.	
6	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS 6.1 Students have to find creative ways to discover study room space. One student befriended a cleaning staff member, who opened a locked empty classroom.	

Prepared by: **CS&P Architects Inc.**

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035.30
Date: November 30, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – Graduate Students**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Queen's Graduate Student Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen's Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen's Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments: 3.1 Education Library librarians excellent and staff very helpful. 3.2 Stauffer Library warm and welcoming. 3.3 Law Library has a good staff student relationship. Graduate students have more contact with library staff. 3.4 Carpet on Second Floor of Law Library is preferred floor finish, cozy and good acoustically.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments: 4.1 Education Library too crowded during teacher candidate periods. 4.2 Douglas Library cold and unwelcoming. 4.3 Bracken Library lower level not inviting. Upper Level has a lack of meeting rooms; available rooms always booked. Strong demand from Health Science students. 4.4 Law Library has poor ventilation and furniture uncomfortable. Hours of operation good, evening hours could be lengthened. Disconnect with staff hours of operation – 9 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Graduate students desire more contact with library staff outside staff operation hours. Students service library between 4:00 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. Security sketchy. Too many unused periodicals. A lot of books not used, perhaps some de-accessioning might be appropriate. 4.5 Stauffer Library Basement Level has no windows and no electrical outlets. Book self check-out does not work. Learning Commons heavily used. Stauffer Library Gallery booth area and cafe 'cold' in nature.	
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments: 5.1 Most libraries require furniture with accommodations for barrier free use.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	5.2	All libraries to offer a range of group study spaces as well as quiet study spaces.
	5.3	Access to libraries paramount, i.e. hours of operation.
	5.4	Access to digital resources very important.
	5.5	Libraries should be associative places, with access to resources.
	5.6	Stauffer Library Gallery (Ground Floor) could be developed into a more dynamic space with art featured etc.
	5.7	Quick access kiosks should be added to all library floors.
	5.8	Role of the future librarian is to help students access digital technology.

Prepared by: **CS&P Architects Inc.**

Minutes of Meeting

Queen' Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035.30
Date: November 29, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates LTD
Reich+Petch Architects Inc.
Novita Techne

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – Faculty**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Queen's Faculty Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen's Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen's Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like?	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	Please share your ideas.	
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments: 3.1 Every faculty has dedicated librarian/s to assist in program integration. 3.2 Archives and libraries support interdisciplinary work, facilitating efficiencies and synergies. Health Science 3.3 Good group study rooms and quiet space areas. 3.4 Faculty embedded in library – excellent librarian planned searches. 3.5 Excellent collaboration with hospital. 3.6 Emerging Technology Centre, with e-learning specialists effectively support students located remote to Queen's campus through video conferencing. (students on laptops w/cameras) Staff very supportive. Arts & Science 3.7 Stauffer Library works well. Student carrels are the preferred study mode and fill up first. Aesthetics and ambiance of Stauffer library space excellent. 3.8 Remote access of library increasing. (eg. from cafes, etc.) 3.9 Douglas Library works well as a destination for quiet study. Education 3.10 Education Library integrated well with Teacher Resource Centre and the local school board usage. Teacher kits used extensively.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments: Health Science 4.1 Not enough group study rooms. 4.2 E-books are subject to contractual terms and are often not useable. In some cases only excerpts can be posted online.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	Arts & Science	
4.3	Art history collection moved to Stauffer is now full. (culling of document duplicates is underway)	
4.4	Class sizes increasing, with large student classes becoming common. Class materials are likely to go on reserve.	
4.5	Anatomy TV does not work, as it is often used simultaneously, with too many users.	
4.6	Mathematics Department - Jeffery Hall does have enough study spaces. (register controlled space)	
4.7	Exclusive use of the film library – more access to space requested. (Film & Media Studies scheduled to be moved to Isabel Bader Centre – currently under construction)	
	Centre for Teaching & Learning (CTL)	
4.8	CTL is located in the lower level of the Macintosh Corry Hall Building, and is not integrated with any Library location.	
	Education	
4.9	Remote from main campus by 1 kilometer.	
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments:	
5.1	Support and expand the Emerging Technology Centre to deliver e-learning to students remote from the Queen's campus.	
5.2	Add more services on-line.	
5.3	Include some study space in Stauffer Library for mathematics tutorial sessions (100 students) by clearing out some of the stacks.	
5.4	Some felt a Library should primarily serve as a library, not as a classroom/teaching use, and provide a peaceful place for research and study.	
5.5	Future Library to address a new alchemy of spaces.	
5.6	Cultural studies a fast growing field. Queen's working printing press – resurgence of interest. Commit to both, not competitive. Library could stage this encounter of digital + craft mediums.	
5.7	Provide more gallery space in libraries and archives.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
6	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	
6.1	Arts & Science - 85% of Queen's arts and sciences students are on campus, with the remaining students off campus e-learning. There is a desire to grow the e-learning student body.	

Prepared by: **CS&P Architects Inc.**

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project: 12035.30
Date: November 29, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.
Reich+Petch Architects Inc.
Novita Techne

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
	1.1 Consult Archives Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen’s Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen’s Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like?	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	Please share your ideas.	
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">3.1 Centrally located and dedicated to Archives.3.2 Idea of the building being heritage is important.3.3 No windows in stack area is positive.3.4 No water pipes over existing stacks.3.5 Good size conservation laboratory with sinks and northern light.3.6 Good climate control, including 3 dedicated zones (basement east vault with compact shelving + office + west storage vaults), however some dampness in the basement.3.7 Reading Room large and bright with east and north facing windows.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">4.1 Building orientation confusing, particularly front entrance (difficult to find).4.2 No parking provided for staff or visitors.4.3 Building has reached capacity, due to floor loading restrictions.4.4 Inadequate off-site storage.4.5 Shelving size inappropriate in much of the building, 12" depth utilized instead of the standard 15". This results in documents extending beyond the shelf causing retrieval difficulty.4.6 No digitization programme plan in place. Digitizing occurs on the second floor4.7 No fire suppression system.4.8 Dampness in basement stacks (portable dehumidifier resolves immediate issue).4.9 HVAC servicing poor on 4th floor, one existing staff office window air conditioner, no air conditioning in remaining staff offices.4.10 Reading Room has few electrical outlets and is too small. Room also functions as a multi-purpose space which is often disruptive to individual research students and staff.4.11 Archives lacking a variety of room sizes, such as a room to accommodate 6-8 users working together, a classroom for a larger group, and space for the	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	private enquiries.	
	4.12 Insufficient public washrooms, one on each floor, causing security issues as the public are unescorted.	
	4.13 Inappropriate location of reception, remote from front entrance.	
	4.14 Absence of a museum or display space (instead a de facto collection at Queen's).	
<hr/>		
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments:	
	5.1 Welcoming front entrance.	
	5.2 Location convenient for visitors, with amenities such as parking and main road access. 60% of Archives collection noted as being private.	
	5.3 Offices consolidated in one area remote from the Reading Room.	
	5.4 Space to accommodate undergraduate & graduate students, alumni, Advancement, and public training sessions, up to 30 people.	
	5.5 Quick on-site retrieval.	
	5.6 Museum space to display, recognize, celebrate, and spark interest in Queen's University history. Display space noted as having a positive effect on potential donors.	
	5.7 Equipment such as walk-in freezers to accommodate specific media.	
	5.8 Protected (enclosed) loading space.	
	5.9 Partnerships with the community.	
	5.10 Space to house Queen's Tricolour Outlet may be a good synergy.	
	5.11 Strong association with Humanities and Social Sciences (core of Archives holdings).	

Prepared by: CS&P Architects Inc.

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project: 12035.30
Date: November 30, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – Bracken Library**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
	1.1 Consult Bracken Library Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen’s Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen’s Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments:	
	3.1 Bracken Library has a strong partnership with 2 hospitals – interprofessional collaboration and student collaboration. Hospital partners pay for service.	
	3.2 Strong association with University of Toronto, McMaster, Western and Ottawa for collection development and last print copy retention.	
	3.3 Faculty embedded in library. Librarians teach, mark assignments, and interact with students.	
	Ground Floor	
	3.4 All library staff located on main floor makes for easy interaction with users.	
	3.5 Good location of Librarians’ offices allows for easy access and collaboration.	
	3.6 Building location – near user population, entrance area right of main doors – easy access, ground floor; wheelchair accessible.	
	3.7 Meeting place for all health students and faculty – encourages interprofessional interactions.	
	3.8 All users (from university and community) are welcome.	
	3.9 Space is open and flexible.	
	3.10 Clean, sophisticated environment, serious study/work atmosphere.	
	3.11 Very good lighting and windows in the user space.	
	3.12 Warm and inviting: plants, sculptures.	
	3.13 Strong wireless access.	
	3.14 Main service point centrally located and visible from main entrance. Good sightlines between service points.	
	3.15 Restricted food and drink policy.	
	3.16 Six study rooms and computer pods heavily used (CHEER - Centre for Health Electronic Education Resources). Area considered to be ‘Learning Commons’ space.	
	3.17 Amenities very good, including e-Lab (24 laptops), videoconference room, study rooms, and laptop use areas.	
	3.18 Dedicated staff washroom and nice staff room with windows.	
	3.19 Library has direct access to the loading dock from the staff area.	
	3.20 Building Lost and Found central depository.	
	3.21 PPS and building Administrative Offices are adjacent to library – great for emergencies, security, etc.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	<p>Basement Level</p> <p>3.22 Print collection consolidated in one location on this level.</p> <p>3.23 Strong wireless access.</p> <p>3.24 Bright lounge with windows and new popular furniture.</p> <p>3.25 Designated quiet study throughout space. Stacks and carpet contribute to good acoustics.</p> <p>3.26 Mixture of various seating options; carrels, tables, benches, booths, computer workstations.</p> <p>3.27 Plants and art work.</p> <p>3.28 Public washrooms.</p> <p>3.29 Building has a cafeteria.</p>	
4	<p>EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES</p> <p>Stakeholder comments:</p> <p>Ground Floor</p> <p>4.1 No external entry/exit – entry through main entrance to Botterell Hall.</p> <p>4.2 Six Study Rooms designed to accommodate 18 students – too large. More smaller rooms required (for thesis defence, etc.).</p> <p>4.3 Building is shared with all Life Sciences departments where research is conducted and therefore contains chemicals, radioactive and biohazard material as well as the Animal Care facility (a target for animal rights groups).</p> <p>4.4 Laboratories above library often have leaks due to malfunctioning or poorly maintained equipment.</p> <p>4.5 HVAC system not upgraded as requested in 2005 renovation. Heat pumps not maintained and often break down resulting in leaks in the user and collection spaces.</p> <p>4.6 Book return slot open when library closed, causing a security/safety risk.</p> <p>4.7 Elevator difficult to locate.</p> <p>4.8 Circulation Desk location is not ideal in relation to the entrance/exit when alarm rings (too far).</p> <p>4.9 No windows in staff offices.</p> <p>4.10 E-lab configuration restricted. Consider potential multi-use function.</p> <p>4.11 Reference Desk is less used (more librarian consultation in offices). Consider re-purposing and removing the print Reference collection.</p>	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	4.12	No dedicated consultation room. Room required given small size of librarian offices. Not enough accessible electrical power outlets.
	4.13	Floor power monuments collect dirt/grit and become difficult to use. Consider ceiling power drops.
	4.14	Some unused space in staff areas, due to downsizing (staff 20 in 2005, now 12)
		Basement Level
	4.15	Low ceiling height. Light fixtures scheduled to be replaced – opportunity to raise ceiling if possible.
	4.16	Lower Level decor is dated, except in Lounge area.
	4.17	Poor plumbing and dated washrooms.
	4.18	Cell phone reception poor.
	4.19	Not enough small group rooms.
	4.20	No natural light except in Lounge area.
	4.21	Not enough accessible electrical power outlets.
	4.22	Print collection dusty – what is the impact on air quality?
	4.23	Heat pumps are not maintained and often break down resulting in leaks in user and collection spaces.
	4.24	Some poorly used space. Work underway to identify print journals which could be removed to accommodate improved user space such as small study rooms which are in great demand. Consider graduate student spaces for rent.
	4.25	Custodial equipment and supplies do not have appropriate storage and clutter the space.
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION	
		Stakeholder comments:
	5.1	QUL should continue to support a user-centered approach to library services. Different users have specific needs.
	5.2	Spaces and collections need to serve deep research.
	5.3	Flexible space.
	5.4	Individual study 'pods' may be desirable and possibly be rented out to graduate students only.
	5.5	Add lockers and coat hanging area.
	5.6	Flat screens in study rooms to support collaborative work?

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	5.7	Phone/laptop 'charge' stations similar to airports.
	5.8	Energy conservation/sustainability should be encouraged.
	5.9	Continuation of heavy digital acquisition (currently 94% of Health Science acquisitions are digital).
	5.10	Digital conversion of existing books.
	5.11	Creation of a Writing Centre space maybe useful.

Prepared by: CS&P Architects Inc.

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project: 12035.30
Date: November 30, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – Douglas Library**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Douglas Library Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen's Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen's Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like?	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	Please share your ideas.	
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments: 3.1 'Harry Potter' Reading Room bright, wonderful ambiance with plenty of natural light. Graduate students appreciate the wood panelling and book covered walls. Jordan Special Collections & Music Library 3.2 Jordan Library is a quiet area and has consistent users (not just Music students and users of Special Collections) who are looking for a quiet place to work. 3.3 Patrons appreciate the Music listening station configuration – these are carrels which are ganged together but offer a separation of space 3.4 Patrons like the 2 six-person tables – one in the Music stacks area and the other in the Music/Special Collections reference area. Engineering and Science Library 3.5 Good sized staff lounge on Ground Floor. 3.6 Level 5 (floor above Ground) librarian offices (6) pleasant with a lot of natural light.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments: 4.1 Physical space and orientation in Douglas Library confusing. There are 4 levels below ground. 4.2 Lack of visibility and connectivity of staff space makes it difficult to assist students. Jordan Special Collections & Music Library 4.3 Some outdated equipment at Music Listening Stations; equipment provided originally by School of Music at the time of opening of Jordan Library in 1999 and has not been updated since opening; there is a need for rationalizing	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	equipment offered in light of access to digital Music resources (Smithsonian Music Online and Naxos) and updating equipment to take advantage of new technology; clarification about budget responsibility for upgrading the equipment would be wise (School of Music or QUL?)	
4.4	Readers complain from time to time that Special Collections Reading Room is too cold; this Reading Room, along with the adjacent Special Collections Workroom are environmentally controlled by the same system that controls the HVAC in the Special Collections stacks.	
4.5	Visitors from other institutions using Special Collections are not able to connect their laptops to access QUL resources; Systems is investigating the question of how the Library might provide guest access; an issue which is of concern for Special Collections.	
4.6	HVAC in the Special Collections stacks fluctuates outside acceptable thermal levels in the Spring and the Fall at the time Physical Plant Services activates the air conditioning in the building or the heating systems.	
4.7	Equipment in the Graham George Seminar Room should be updated, especially the speakers which have been in place since 1999 and have deteriorated over time.	
4.8	Configuration of the lighting control setup (not enough flexibility) and the level of lighting (too dim) in the Graham George Seminar Room is a concern (not flexible enough).	
4.9	Collection space is at/beyond capacity for both Music and Special Collections; Special Collections has recently established new location codes for collection storage in Stauffer Library.	
4.10	Music Reference Collection should be weeded with some materials withdrawn and others reshelved in the circulating collection. However there is no space to reshelve materials. The same situation applies for Special Collections.	
4.11	Special Collections materials are now stored on the third floor south mezzanine of the 1966 Reading Room (Robertson Davies Library, Tellier Collection) and there is no HVAC control in this area.	
4.12	Some Special Collections materials are stored in Stauffer Library (LP vinyls, Gothic Fantasy, early newspapers, St. Mary's Collection); some on the shelves; some boxed up and inaccessible.	
4.13	Music Choral Collection (owned by the School of Music but serviced by the Jordan Library staff) is housed on the third floor mezzanine north of the 1966 Reading Room and there is no HVAC control of this area. Historically, when	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	the Music Library was located in Harrison-LeCaine Hall, library staff members maintained this collection (which was stored in various locations in Harrison-LeCaine and then in the basement of Watson Hall; several years ago, the Library agreed to provide space in Douglas Library and the School of Music paid for the renovation to accommodate this collection.	
4.14	Display area is small and the display cabinets are not of the best design for exhibition purposes.	
4.15	Lack of sufficient secure workspace for processing/staging of Special Collections materials is a real concern; the Special Collections workroom also serves as the storage location for the Music CD/DVD/LP collection and is accessed by student assistants during evenings and on weekends.	
4.16	Way-finding in the building is difficult for patrons (i.e. floors/levels cause confusion).	
4.17	Unfinished space at the south end of the floor represents lost opportunity for more reader, collection and display space.	
4.18	The Special Collections Reading Room is adjacent to the Circulation Desk and the Conservation Workroom. It shares the same HVAC system as the Conservation Workroom and the Special Collections stacks. Patrons complain that the Reading Room is too cold.	
4.19	Graham George Seminar Room (multi-use room); can accommodate around 40; used for some School of Music and Department of Art classes, as a presentation space for classes using Special Collections resources; as a meeting room by QUL and as a lecture space associated with exhibitions; is equipped with an overhead projection system and speakers; speakers should be replaced; lighting control system is not adequate for teaching purposes; lighting in the room is inadequate.	
4.20	Exhibition/Display space is fairly small. The number of and design of the cabinets is less than ideal. Lighting is less than ideal.	
4.21	Decline in demand for Music CD's & DVD's	
4.22	Collections and Practice Rooms separated - not a good relationship.	
4.23	Music Collection (Jordan), combined rare books better paired with Archives.	
4.24	Not a lot of interaction between the Special Collections and Engineering & Science Libraries, different users.	
	Engineering and Science Library	
4.25	Engineering collection use is dropping precipitously.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	4.26	No space at Douglas Library for engineering graduate students.
	4.27	No space for engineering peer to peer tutoring.
	4.28	Ground Floor privacy an issue at the Circulation Workroom area. Storage items (office supplies) openly visible to library users.
	4.29	Ground Floor Access Service Librarian Office isolated. Privacy screening on glazed partition preferred option.
	4.30	Ground Floor Shared service desk (reference and circulation) – issues include: lighting, temperature, drafts and noise.
	4.31	Level 5 (floor above Ground) librarian offices (6) – issues include: difficulty opening windows (due to storm panes), temperature and soundproofing in some of the offices.
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION	
	Stakeholder comments:	
	5.1	Integrate Librarians into student spaces; make librarians more visible and accessible.
	5.2	Create more space to accommodate student/librarian consultation.
	5.3	Create more student study rooms.
	5.4	Create more peer to peer tutoring rooms.

Prepared by: **CS&P Architects Inc.**

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project: 12035.30
Date: November 30, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – Education Library**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Education Library Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW	
	Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session:	
	Questions:	
	1. Existing Facilities – Queen’s Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses	
	What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan?	
	2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future	
	The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen’s Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">3.1 Education Library well integrated with the faculty and with the local School Boards' staff.3.2 Teacher Resource Centre has good partnership with Education Library. Heavy use of Centre during 5th year Practicum. (8 months)3.3 Education Library location has synergies with the Education program, as all 4th Year courses of education program are taught at West Campus.3.4 Education program integrated with resources.3.5 Acquisitions funding still goes to print growth.3.6 Strong on-line student education.3.7 Education Library resource intensive.3.8 Circulation – second highest at Queen's.3.9 Text books integrate with technologies, e.g. use of smart boards.3.10 Excellent historic collections. Heavy use by researchers.3.11 Good use of library space, two courses taught in library, one in large open space, and one in electronic classroom.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none">4.1 Technology integration, including IT support.4.2 Very little interdisciplinary interaction.4.3 Public Areas – issues: lighting and light replacement, dangerous southwest corner stair (exposed bent supported rails), not enough quiet space, and reserve shelving maxed out.4.4 Staff Areas – issues: location of shared printer in Circulation area problematic. Should be easily assessable to everyone working in this area, no cubicles or offices provided for the library technicians who are on call to help the public at all times, technical services work area too large (staff has been downsized from 3 full time staff to 1 plus 1 part time staff), no windows in offices and work spaces, staff/lounge/kitchen is a make-shift corridor, head librarian office and	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	adjacent staff break area has privacy issues, and no staff meeting room large enough to accommodate entire staff.	
4.5	Security not on west campus in the evening.	
4.6	No staff washrooms.	
<hr/>		
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments:	
5.1	Development of a design studio, where teaching and critical learning can take place.	
5.2	Creation of a library as a more interactive space.	
5.3	Introduction of an Education Learning Commons, with classrooms and learning spaces.	
5.4	Strengthening of the existing partnerships between Queen's University, the 2 neighbouring school boards, and education of existing regional area teachers and staff.	
5.5	Expansion of the TRC (Teacher Resource Centre).	
5.6	21 st Century School - strengthening of work force skills (presentation skills).	

Prepared by: CS&P Architects Inc.

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035.30
Date: November 30, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – Law Library**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Law Library Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen's Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen's Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

	ITEM	ACTION
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments:	
	3.1 Well used central Reading Room with a lot of natural light.	
	3.2 Well used 3 group study rooms.	
	3.3 Upper Level of library well lit.	
	3.4 Book lined walls provides a wonderful ambiance to the library.	
	3.5 Mystery of the Law Collection area has good furniture, including couches and variation in seating.	
	3.6 Librarian offices immediately adjacent to the Reading Room, creating good synergy between the staff and students. Strong visual contact important.	
	3.7 Excellent electronic Conference Room for faculty.	
	3.8 Staff area air conditioned, although some issues with system.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments:	
	4.1 There are security issues with moots (simulated court proceedings) occurring at all hours. Students servicing library after hours.	
	4.2 Not enough student moot court rooms. Rooms should be sized to accommodate 4 to 5 students, whiteboard or blackboard, and with projector capability.	
	4.3 No space for tutoring. (peer to peer tutoring)	
	4.4 Too much use of law spaces by non-law students, resulting in law students not being able to find space for activities such as researching for legal papers, particularly at end of semester when assignments are due and exam prep is underway.	
	4.5 More classroom space in Library is desired.	
	4.6 No hard electrical outlets at study carrels and circulation desk.	
	4.7 Poor lighting on the Lower Level, row of graduate carrels outside of graduate study area always dark.	
	4.8 Canadian market small, therefore much of Canadian law in print.	
	4.9 Graduate students have difficulty finding study space during exam time.	
	4.10 Alumni do not have access to library, consultation by phone.	
	4.11 No air conditioning. (except staff area)	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

	ITEM	ACTION
	4.12 Shortage of washrooms due to servicing and infrastructure issues.	
	4.13 Problems with the window shades in the main Reading Room. Often shades are fixed to avoid blinding afternoon sun. Lack of shading device also impacts on temperature in the room.	
	4.14 There is a problem with rodents chewing through window screens.	
	4.15 There are issues with the elevator, including service and security.	
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments:	
	5.1 Include a Writing Support Service in Law Library. Service not provided at Stauffer Library.	
	5.2 U.B.C. good precedent example.	
	5.3 Create more group study rooms which can be reserved.	
	5.4 Create more individual study spaces in the Basement.	
	5.5 Create a safe library able to be accessed at any time.	
	5.6 Design comfortable, flexible furniture with different seating options to outfit library. (more armchairs and relaxed seating)	
	5.7 Provide floor mounted electrical outlets to accommodate the ubiquitous use of laptops.	
6	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	
	6.1 Law Library heavily used by Law students, engineering and commerce students and general public. Private lawyers use facility. Library very quiet.	
	6.2 Library centrally funded. (different paradigm)	
	6.3 Librarians teach legal research in credit courses and in presentations.	
	6.4 Collections – case law is digitized, secondary sources in print.	
	6.5 High circulation material stored in Reserve Room.	
	6.6 Many law books are used in a very physical manner, with page flipping back and forth.	
	6.7 Canada at this time not moving as rapidly towards Law Journal digitization as the U.S. This creates disparities in digital journal access between the two countries.	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

	ITEM	ACTION
6.8	Basement stores the periodicals, Level 1 – statutes, gazettes, reference collection, Level 2 – stacks. Some storage in Stauffer Library.	
6.9	Collections in the Law Library include government documents including statutes and regulations (federal and provincial), supporting documents and gazettes. Some material is located in Stauffer.	
6.10	Physical statutes and regulations must be stored on site for law degree to be accredited.	
6.11	Kingston Legal Aid would like to be located within the Law Library building: they require 2,000 sf.	

Prepared by: CS&P Architects Inc.

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035.30
Date: November 30, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – Stauffer Library**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Stauffer Library Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen’s Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen’s Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

	ITEM	ACTION
3	EXISTING FACILITIES – STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments:	
3.1	Beloved library by both students and staff.	
3.2	Abundance of natural light throughout Stauffer Library, except some areas in Basement.	
3.3	Heavily used study carrels, first choice of students.	
3.4	Ground Floor main large tables well used.	
3.5	Ground Floor Gallery space well located exposure to a lot of pedestrian travel.	
3.6	Adaptive Technology Centre well located and used.	
3.7	Staff space and break room in Writing Centre well used and sized.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES – WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments:	
4.1	No natural light in Basement Level at staff areas. (20 people +/- plus IT staff) Some natural light in student area of Basement; however students close blinds preventing light from penetrating into staff areas.	
4.2	Basement microfiche government documents intensively used, but not ideally located.	
4.3	Basement shared staff lounge not well utilized. Space not welcoming.	
4.4	Too many unused books in the Basement. Many collections could potentially be relegated to compact storage.	
4.5	Lacking instructional spaces, egg. small teaching spaces.	
4.6	Not enough group study rooms. High demand for 8 student group space.	
4.7	Copy centre too remote.	
4.8	Acoustic problems in Stauffer Library.	
4.9	Not enough stairs in Library.	
4.10	Ground Floor main reference desk underutilized. More consultation with librarians occur in their offices.	
4.11	Learning & Research Services Group do not have a communal space to gather. (for lunch, breaks, etc.)	
4.12	Writing Centre space inadequate.	
4.13	Lockable graduate student study carrels a problem for undergraduate	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

	ITEM	ACTION
	students. One idea to delete lockable carrels and replace with lockers.	
4.14	Lack of high technology study rooms. No designated space for presentations.	
4.15	More AV centres necessary, only one existing in Basement. Good precedent example at the University of Calgary.	
4.16	No classroom space provided in Stauffer Library.	
4.17	Fireplace Reading Room a wonderful space, but awkward for hosting events. Furniture heavy, difficulty re-configuring room.	
4.18	Gallery Office space has no heating.	
4.19	Poor climate control in Stauffer Library; too hot or too cold, and noisy in some spaces such as in some of the Second Floor Offices.	
4.20	Lack of staff washrooms on Second Floor.	
4.21	Many spaces in the Library not used during the summer months.	
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments:	
5.1	Diversify library by creating more services similar to a mall or an 'Idea Store'.	
5.2	Creation of a flexible classroom space able to accommodate 45-50 students, and with the ability to sub-divide.	
5.3	Develop the Fireplace Reading Room into a space able to host presentations. Celebrate and exploit this awesome space for multiple uses.	
5.4	Space planning of Stauffer Library was based on a book stack plan, today more space should be dedicated for people use such as more student study rooms.	
5.5	Integrate Librarians into student spaces, make them more visible and accessible.	
5.6	Create more space to accommodate student/librarian consultation.	

Prepared by: CS&P Architects

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035.30
Date: November 30, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – QLC (Queen's Learning Commons) Partners**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult QLC Partners	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen's Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen's Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

	ITEM	ACTION
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments:	
3.1	Students working at the service desk – students helping students (8:30 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. most days) Good successful practice.	
3.2	Relocation of the Writing Centre to Stauffer Library - raising profile and increasing use.	
3.3	Heavy use of Speaker's Corner by entire student body.	
3.4	Strong Learning Commons model – hub of services supporting academic programs as well as a meeting place.	
3.5	Decentralized university library.	
3.6	Adaptive Technology Centre lab used by all students (with or without disabilities) – good synergy.	
3.7	IT services visible and mostly in one location.	
3.8	One successful study space on campus is the Red Room Lounge in Kingston Hall, which could be used as a precedent.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments:	
4.1	Stauffer Library Writing Centre located in remote area, at back of building. Centre sometimes interrupts Speaker's Corner and vice versa.	
4.2	Speaker's Corner has acoustic issues.	
4.3	Some stigmatization associated with the Writing Centre (as remedial).	
4.4	Not enough spaces to accommodate tutorials, 'peers helping peers.' (eg. Jeffery Hall Basement accommodating 1 st Year Math tutorial classes, which might be better served in Stauffer Library).	
4.5	Emerging Technologies (an aspect of student success) located remote to the Learning Commons.	
4.6	Not enough offices in the Adaptive Technology Centre.	
4.7	IT Services – back end integration does not happen. (not working well)	
4.8	Growing demand for data services (now in basement)	
4.9	Union Gallery not part of the Learning Commons area.	
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

ITEM

ACTION

Stakeholder comments:

- 5.1 Create a Learning Commons which strengthens peer to peer relationships, 'students helping students' within each library - celebrate students as ambassadors - greeting students and inviting engagement.
 - 5.2 Develop whole university as 'Learning Commons.'
 - 5.3 Create a graduate 'Learning Commons.'
 - 5.4 Design workshop spaces that are flexible, able to accommodate 5 to 15 students with movable furniture.
 - 5.5 Support new needs of faculty and students.
 - 5.6 Locate 'Career Services' within the Stauffer Library Learning Commons area. (currently located in Gordon Hall with Student Affairs)
 - 5.7 Exploit the organic nature of the library, find inherent opportunities to expand, plan for flexibility, allow the library to evolve to meet future demands.
 - 5.8 Integration with faculty – key to success.
 - 5.9 Add health and wellness to the Learning Commons.
 - 5.10 Pilot a 'Writing Centre' project in Douglas Library? – free help, students helping students.
 - 5.11 View every service through an academic lens.
 - 5.12 Finding ways for the Queen's community to work together as partners in the Learning Commons would be beneficial.
-

Prepared by: CS&P Architects Inc.

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035.30
Date: November 29, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.
Reich+Petch Architects Inc.
Novita Techne

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting - Academic Services**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Academic Services Stakeholders	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
2	<p>PROJECT OVERVIEW</p> <p>Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session:</p> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Existing Facilities – Queen’s Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan?2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen’s Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	
3	<p>EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS</p> <p>Stakeholder comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3.1 Accessibility in Stauffer Library good, including 3 staff offices, 1 library technician and an adaptive technology office. Bracken Library 2005 renovation improved accessibility, including a lowered service desk. Archives cited as having poor accessibility.3.2 Law Library has a good relationship between the 3 offices and open reading room. All Law librarians have teaching roles, and are visually accessible to students.	
4	<p>EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES</p> <p>Stakeholder comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4.1 No instruction space in Stauffer Library for tutorial groups (often 27 students).4.2 No electronic classroom in Stauffer Library. University of Calgary’s digital library cited as good precedent.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	4.3	Office spaces tight, making it difficult to accommodate students. Additional consultation space recommended, with office equipment including computer and printer. Visual access important.
	4.4	Safety a concern for librarians in remote areas of the libraries.
<hr/>		
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments:	
	5.1	Create flexible spaces and furniture in the libraries and archives.
	5.2	Aspire to have more ‘Learning Commons’ spaces – a physical location and a virtual presence to enhance learning. Could include writing counsellors; integrate librarians and peer training (students).
	5.3	Provide more video conferencing spaces.
<hr/>		
6	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	
	6.1	The way librarians help students is changing, fewer students request help, but require longer time spent with librarian. Short questions are delivered electronically to the library.
	6.2	80% of students are using laptops. Use of Mac computers is increasing.
	6.3	Stauffer Library and the Learning Commons employ students for different kinds of roles – some offer workshops, some return books to the shelves. (some paid, some volunteer)
	6.4	Discovery Systems (IT) – part of each library. Contact is by e-mail directly or forms which get directed. Video used at Queen’s campus. Some social media.
	6.5	Archives uses general e-mail mailbox. Reference questions require a couple of days for turnaround. Twitter provides immediate response.
	6.6	Issues with the use of copyrighted material. Changes to copyright law and Queen’s fair dealing policy expected, which will allow faculty to upload more material on-line.
	6.7	Multiple learning management systems (eg. MEdTech (Medical Education Technology) are being offered at Queen’s to enhance learning and teaching by integrating educational technology solutions.

Prepared by: CS&P Architects Inc.

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project: 12035.30
Date: November 29, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.
Reich+Petch Architects Inc.
Novita Techne

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting – Collections**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Collections Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen's Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen's Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments:	
	3.1 Queen's libraries have a wealth of collections, with special collections space consolidated in Douglas Library. Special collections include the Canadian collection, the non-Canadian collection, 3 science collections, and several private collections.	
	3.2 Archives has a renown collection of literary papers, public affairs collections, business papers, regional collections, photographs, architectural drawings, sound and moving images, and fine arts collections.	
	3.3 Education Library collection has strong circulation statistics, and well used kit collections in the adjoining teacher resource centre.	
	3.4 Collections are utilized by the University and by the community.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments:	
	4.1 Collections growing yearly, existing facilities cannot accommodate growth. Collection space is at/beyond capacity for both Music and Special Collections; Music Reference Collection should be weeded with some materials withdrawn and others re-shelved in the circulating collection, except that there is no space to re-shelve materials there; the same situation applies to Special Collections.	
	4.2 Collection display space insufficient, including undersized display cabinets Lack of sufficient secure workspace for processing/staging of Special Collections materials is a real concern; the Special Collections workroom also serves as the storage location for the Music CD/DVD/LP collection and is accessed by student assistants.	
	4.3 Bound periodical collections in every library occupying too much space. Some periodicals should be weeded, for example in Health Sciences Library where the trend is digitizing. Periodicals in Stauffer Library (second floor) could also be re-located and bound journals in the engineering library could be deleted. Humanities tend to keep many printed journals.	
	4.4 Jordan Library has single circulation desk, with collection access by staff. No retrieval on weekends, security an issue.	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments:	
	5.1 Consolidation of collections and archives, opportunity for synergies.	
	5.2 Creation of a 'Humanities Research Centre' for scholarly communication	
	5.3 Integrating today's and future technologies into the library and archives in a meaningful way.	
	5.4 Promoting/showcasing Queen's collections.	
	5.5 Developing pragmatic storage options within Queen's precinct and remote to the campus.	
	5.6 Developing a digital facility housed possibly in one central location, for example in Douglas Library.	
6	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	
	6.1 Douglas Library – historical context – Queen's first purpose built facility. Vision around Douglas was the consolidation of 19 branch libraries. Engineering and science consolidation occurred in 1997.	
	6.2 Preservation – collections must be in a controlled environment.	

Prepared by: **CS&P Architects Inc.**

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035.30
Date: November 29, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.
Reich+Petch Architects Inc.
Novita Techne

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting - IT**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult IT Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session: Questions: 1. Existing Facilities – Queen’s Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan? 2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen’s Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	
3	EXISTING FACILITIES - STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments: 3.1 Great partnership – IT plus library 3.2 Queen's Resource Data Centre (QRDC) in Stauffer Library is a huge resource for scholars on campus. 3.3 Bracken Faculty Teaching Room (Centre for Health Electronic Resources-CHEER) is a successful feature.	
4	EXISTING FACILITIES - WEAKNESSES Stakeholder comments: 4.1 Social Media – Queen's supports twitter, etc. However, there is not a well defined approach for management. Approach should be coordinated, and should include all social media supported, not just Queen's website. No plan exists for integrating all media. 4.2 Stauffer Library (Room 121) has tables on wheels and laptop table which results in jacks being pulled out of the walls. 4.3 Library Classroom not registered controlled. 4.4 There are cost implications to increasing Queen's Data Centre capacity, and acquiring more hard drive space. Data Centre is currently not at capacity.	
5	LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION Stakeholder comments: 5.1 Create more collaborative spaces with conference wall, rooms tailored for student use, able to be re-configured, with flexible furniture, a large screen, and easy access to video conferencing. 5.2 Provide more immersive labs, with more services such as 3D Printing at Dalhousie Libraries. 5.3 Provide furniture that is flexible, tables that can be re-configured. Include tables to accommodate 4 students with one monitor to allow for collaboration	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued	ITEM	ACTION
	and tables to accommodate 8 students with a LCD screen.	
5.4	Allow librarians to communicate more with faculty, sometimes face to face and sometimes via video conferencing.	
5.5	Emerging Technologies Centre – Centre for Teaching and Learning might be appropriately placed in the Learning Commons.	
5.6	Create a DMZ (Digital Media Zone) similar to Ryerson’s DMZ which is a multidisciplinary workspace for research and learning. This hub of digital media innovation, collaboration and commercialization is home to both entrepreneurial companies and industry solution-providers.	
5.7	Include Fiber Drop display technology.	
5.8	Create different types of study spaces - formal (enclosed), 3-sided space (semi-enclosed) and open.	
5.9	Future library – the ‘Learning Commons’ is a very successful model.	
5.10	Priority – How to formulate a ‘Library of Alexandria’ – as a major centre of scholarship – complete with walking spaces for scholars.	
<hr/>		
6	ADDITIONAL COMMENTS	
6.1	Queen’s Internet Platforms include: 50% Windows, 41% OS X, and a variety of other less used platforms.	
6.2	Archives has established social media usage, particularly twitter, over the last few years.	
6.3	Archives digitization of assets must take an integrated approach. Issues include: how it would impact users, sourcing a trusted digitized repository, designing a sustainable infrastructure, etc.	
6.4	More digital material being moved into the trusted ‘Scholar’s Portal’ database.	
6.5	Archives budget is now integrated into the overall Library budget.	

Prepared by: CS&P Architects Inc.

Minutes of Meeting

Project: Queen's University Library & Archives Master Plan
Kingston, Ontario

Project 12035.30
Date: November 29th, 2012

Present: Queen's Stakeholders
CS&P Architects Inc.
Aaron Cohen Associates Ltd.
Reich+Petch Architects Inc.
Novita Techne

Re: **Stakeholder Meeting - Operations**

	ITEM	ACTION
1	PURPOSE OF MEETING	
1.1	Consult Operations Stakeholders	
2	PROJECT OVERVIEW Architect presented a brief overview of the master plan process and noted the role of the Consultant as facilitator; focusing on listening, engaging and supporting the participation of all stakeholders and with the goal to reach consensus on a shared vision. Architect noted that 2 general questions will be posed at each stakeholder session:	
	Questions:	
	1. Existing Facilities – Queen’s Library & Archives Strengths & Weaknesses What are some of the noteworthy strengths and weaknesses you can identify with the facilities you use and work in, that we should address in the Master Plan?	
	2. Library & Archives Master Plan of the Future The Library & Archives Master Plan presents an extraordinary opportunity to consider the Queen’s Library & Archives network in new and exciting ways	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

	ITEM	ACTION
	which better support changing technologies, teaching, learning and research environments today and in the future. What do you think the plan will look like? Please share your ideas.	
3	EXISTING FACILITIES – STRENGTHS Stakeholder comments: Food Services 3.1 Stauffer only library with food service. 3.2 Botterhall Hall has a good food service at Basement Level, adjacent to Bracken Library space. Event Services 3.3 Stauffer Library Fireplace Reading Room an excellent venue for events. 3.4 Douglas Library a good venue for planned gatherings, such as internal department events. Sometimes used for conferences. Movable furniture would improve this event location. 3.5 Education Library hosts some events, such as staff Christmas parties. 3.6 Public events at Stauffer and Douglas, such as weddings could provide revenue for the library. Facilities 3.7 Stauffer Library seats are 90% utilized. 3.8 Stauffer Library floors are all designed to carry compact shelving. 3.9 Queen's has second highest number of study rooms of Ontario universities. 3.10 Law Library heavily used by law students. 3.11 Engineering Department is well served with 44 group study rooms. Accessibility 3.12 Accessibility accommodations successful in Stauffer Library. Adaptive Technology Centre exemplary, centrally located and recognized for inclusivity, dignity and diversity. Security 3.13 Stauffer Library mostly successful in terms of passive security, as it has good sight lines, lighting, and layout of study areas and stacks.	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

ITEM	ACTION
Construction	
3.14 Good central loading dock at Stauffer Library. Loading dock at Bracken Library and smaller one at Douglas Library.	
4 EXISTING FACILITIES – WEAKNESSES	
Stakeholder comments:	
Food Service	
4.1 Stauffer Library, café is 'on the fringe', operated 'for profit', has a small food preparation space. Carleton University cited as good precedent food space. Noise and garbage an issue.	
Event Services	
4.2 Many opportunities for events to be held within Library spaces. One example given was that a wedding ceremony was held in the fireplace room of Stauffer.	
Facilities	
4.3 Microfiche area in Stauffer Library Ground Floor underutilized and occupies too much space.	
4.4 Douglas Library engineering collection not used extensively (most engineering resources on-line)	
4.5 Graduate Students do not have a designated space.	
4.6 Stauffer Library Speakers Corners too close to Writing Centre.	
4.7 Wayfinding is an issue, too many signs.	
4.8 Off-gassing a problem on many new carpet installations.	
Accessibility	
4.9 No aboriginal art on campus.	
4.10 All libraries, except Stauffer have accessibility issues.	
4.11 Archives have serious accessibility issues.	
Security	
4.12 No security policy for community members.	
4.13 Douglas Library contains some security breaches, such as dead-end stacks.	

These minutes reflect the impressions of the writer. Any questions or comments regarding their accuracy should be made within 10 days of receipt.

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

ITEM	ACTION
4.14 Stauffer Library has a serious theft issue. (Laptops, knapsacks, etc.) Security issues at IT area. Building not designed for 24/7 use.	
4.15 Archives First Floor is vulnerable.	
4.16 Law Library is accessible to the public. Staff often alone and isolated. After hours library staffed by students, security breaches sometimes occur.	
4.17 Education & Law Library have no internal washrooms. Washrooms remote and off the beaten track.	
4.18 Bracken Library access governed by building access.	
4.19 Lack of CCTV surveillance in all libraries and archives.	
Construction	
4.20 Garbage storage at Stauffer Library a problem.	
4.21 Stauffer Library carpet requires replacement, due to food spills and traffic.	
5 LIBRARY & ARCHIVES MASTER PLAN OF THE FUTURE – YOUR VISION	
Stakeholder comments:	
5.1 Create more partnerships between libraries and other services such as events, food, student services, etc.	
5.2 Food Service: Add additional cafes, one per library. Deal effectively with noise and garbage issues. Introduce movable furniture and a cafe to the Fireplace Reading Room to strengthen this location as an event destination. Create an outdoor terrace for cafe. This initiative would require further investigation as student population low during summer term.	
5.3 Event Services: Plan to accommodate different size events for many spaces in the libraries and archives. Libraries can potentially utilize the revenue generated at events.	
5.4 Accessibility: Aim to create an inclusive environment. Make the goal to exceed the minimum requirements. Create universally designed spaces throughout the library network. Provide more adjustable desks, more power door operators, etc. Build to FADS. Create more gender neutral washrooms. Build washrooms to accommodate scooters. Consider introducing prayer rooms. (Goodes Hall cited as a good example)	
5.5 Security: Create safe and secure spaces throughout library campus network. Construction: Maintain flexibility – technology changing rapidly. Look at	

Minutes of Meeting

Continued

ITEM

ACTION

standards and life cycle costing. Large deferred maintenance budget exists. Design for sustainability, as per the Principal's Climate Action Plan, including various targets, of which the built environment represents the largest share).

Prepared by: CS&P Architects Inc.