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This report begins to tell the story of a transformed Dorothy H. Hoover Library. To do this, it first describes a set of transformational opportunities at the Ontario College of Art and Design and then considers a set of aspirations and choices.

In guiding the telling of this story, Jill Patrick, OCAD’s Director of Library Services, invited Scott Bennett and Steven Foote to visit OCAD on 18-20 March 2008. Over these three days, we talked with scores of OCAD students, faculty, administrators, and staff.[[1]](#footnote-1) We are grateful for the warm welcome we received at every turn and for the candid, deeply engaged, and sometimes passionate conversations of which we became a part. It is a great privilege to join in the university’s discourse on the future of its library.

# Transformational opportunities

OCAD’s new status as a university and the striking renovation of the Art Gallery of Ontario are just two of the most obvious signals of the commitment to art and design in both the city and the province. These changes and many others make clear the meaning of one first year student who said he was deeply inspired by the chance to be at OCAD and to be part of the vibrant arts neighborhood it helps to create. He was, quite simply, inspired by the opportunities before him to become an artist.

Some elements in this environment of opportunity are particularly relevant to the transformation of the Hoover Library. They are elements in OCAD’s New Ecology of Learning and include the affirmations that

* “enhanced student engagement is a key requisite if OCAD is to succeed” (p. 9 of “Leading in the Age of Imagination”);
* the practice of art and design at OCAD will be embedded in “theoretical and historical knowledge” (p. 46) and will “integrate historic reflection with contemporary thought” (p. 7);
* “practice-based research is a hallmark of art and design, providing [in both the undergraduate and graduate programs] theoretical knowledge and tangible outcomes” (p. 19);
* OCAD will “foster human skills that combine independence with team-based learning” (p. 7).

These features of the learning environment at OCAD will permeate both the long-established programs of the institution and its new initiatives in liberal studies and graduate preparation; they drive the institution’s engagement with information technology; they provide the rationale for a set of focused undertakings such as the Center for Innovation in Art and Design Education.

In thinking about the future of the Hoover Library in this extraordinary environment of opportunity, there is no better starting place that the strategic plan’s statement of what an OCAD student will become:

Learners will emerge from OCAD as imaginative individuals with deep creative insights and be able to act as part of a community and a team. They will function well within culturally diverse settings, ready to be citizens in complex local and global contexts. They will be ready, willing and able to contribute to ecological, sustainable goals and also able to apply, adapt to and invent new technologies (p. 9).

A transformed Hoover Library is a necessary element in achieving this outcome.

# Acting on opportunity: aspirations and choices

Three OCAD design students have taken the challenge of imagining a transformed Hoover Library as their thesis project. At the outset, they struggled for some weeks with the word *library*, feeling it was too constrained by traditional concepts to represent the place of opportunity they want to create. This narrative accepts the word *library*, as eventually the design students did, and like them focuses on aspirations and on the key choices deeply embedded in every aspiration.

Just as the design students were wrestling with the identity of the library, so were the several faculty members who told us “it is really hard to get students to go to the library.” We wondered what this statement might mean, especially as the library is usually crowded with students. For us, the most illuminating explanations were that:

* Google is the library for today’s students; and
* students do not want to read at length or in depth.

These are pedagogical problems and no amount of comfortable, well-lit space with ample collections and computers will do much to address them. Without question, OCAD needs better fitted-out library space, but its planning for the library must begin not with questions about the *stuff* of library space but rather with questions about the **purpose** of such space—with questions about learning. This is the first aspiration to articulate, the first choice to make.[[2]](#footnote-2)

What might it mean for the Hoover Library to make the choice for learning? The first section of Attachment 2 sets out a number of key questions involved in making this choice—questions that only the OCAD community can answer.[[3]](#footnote-3) These are fundamental questions about choices

* between designing library space to support transactional activities (traditionally the governing principle of library design), or designing it to foster learning in spaces for collaboration; and
* about how library space will relate to other OCAD learning spaces, most particularly its classrooms and studios.

The easy and true response to the first of these choices is that one must design for both. But the hard and true reality is that in an environment as constrained in space as OCAD, doing everything as fully as one might like is impossibly expensive. Choice in this environment will drive the OCAD community to define as sharply as possible what its library should be and what relation the library will have to other campus learning spaces.

If library space is designed primarily to support learning rather than service transactions, the next question is about the **character of the learning** to be fostered. This is the second aspiration that must find its voice through a set of choices. The second section of Attachment 2 explores these choices, which fundamentally involve

* the terms on which students, faculty, and staff will meet in library space, and most particularly the claims to authority that will be made there;
* the ways that “ownership” of library space will be asserted and acknowledged;
* the range of collaboration that will be fostered among academic staff and with faculty members; and
* the degree to which academic staff will work outside of the library’s physical space, in virtual space and in other campus learning spaces.

One of the most fundamental responsibilities of a library is to create a resource-rich environment for learning. As recently as the 1980s, this primarily meant building collections of print and other analog materials. The 1990s brought dramatic change, and now the flow of digital resources is often likened to that of a fire hose. This is evident at the Hoover Library in the fact that while the library subscribed to only 235 serial titles in print and micoformats in FY2007, it provided access to over 7,400 journals in digital form.

So the third aspiration considered here is that of creating a **resource-rich environment** for learning. This is the aspiration not only of the library but also of the Archives, Imaging Services, and the Permanent Collections. The first three of these units confront fateful choices about the management of digital and analog collections, as represented in the questions of the third section of Attachment 2. From a space planning perspective, all four units face equally critical choices about the size of their collections of analogue material and cultural objects, about the environmental conditions those collections require, and about the possibility of holding them (especially less frequently used materials) in locations some distance from the OCAD campus. At base, this is a question about whether the size of the physical collections held on campus can be stabilized so as to free OCAD from the terrible necessity—manifest in the Hoover Library and other libraries across the continent—of accommodating collection growth by reducing the accommodation of readers. For more than a century, this choice has driven a kind of Sisyphean investment in library space, where an ineluctable growth in the need for shelving has ultimately prevailed over the need of space for readers. With the rapid growth of digital collections and the possibilities opened by off-campus shelving facilities, OCAD can now for the first time choose a different future.

# Creating a vision

Much of the planning for the future of the Hoover Library will turn on the institution’s aspirations about library space as learning space, about the terms on which members of the academic community will meet in library space, and about the management of digital and analogue collections.

What is at stake in these aspirations and the choices that attend them was crystallized by the testimony of one particularly articulate student. This student, clearly a deeply engaged and ambitious learner, explained her reluctance to leave her design fabrication space in 100 McCaul to go “all the way” across the street to the library in terms of the intensity of her engagement with studio work. This work of the imagination is so intense, so absorbing, and so liberating that she is often unwilling to leave it even when she needs something to eat. The university can surely take pride in having created so powerful an ecology for learning in its studios. The challenge before OCAD is to create an equally powerful environment for learning in its library space. It must be an environment that is as strong as that of the studios in enabling student success and in fostering a sense of unlimited possibilities grounded in the record of human experience and creativity. In such an environment, one can imagine this student feeling torn in her allegiances to the studio and to the library as compelling and fruitful learning spaces, but she will no longer feel the library to be a distant place with a comparatively weak call on her imaginative life.

The Dorothy H. Hoover Library must be transformed if it is to figure so in the lives of students. That transformation begins with the story told here about the unprecedented opportunities now before OCAD to restate its aspirations for the library and to act on the choices that will make those aspirations real.

Attachment 1: Interview schedule for Scott Bennett & Steven Foote (18-20 March 2008)

**DAY 1 – Tuesday, March 18**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Session | Time | Location | Attendees |
| Tour and Reception | 8:00-9:00am | Library  113McCaul  1201 | **Kathy Shailer**, Acting VP Academic  **Jill Patrick**, Director - Library Services  **Peter Lashko**, Director - Facilities Planning & Management  **Eric Schwab**, Manager - AV & Imaging Services  **Daniel Payne**, Head - Reference, Information & Access Services  **Jim Forrester**, Head - Systems & Technical Services  **Lynn Austin**, Archivist/Records Officer  **Robert Fabbro**, Reference & Access Services Librarian  **Irene Gotz**, Reference Librarian Intern  **Jeff Piersol**, Reference Librarian Intern  **Harriet Mulder**, Circulation/Archives Technician  **Esther Soltau**, Acquisitions Technician |
| Session #1-2 | 9:00-10:00am | 100 McCaul  287 | LIBRARY STAFF – REFERENCE & ACCESS SERVICES  **Jill Patrick**, Director – Library Services  **Daniel Payne**, Head - Reference, Information & Access Services  **Robert Fabbro**, Reference & Access Services Librarian  **Lee Henderson**, Coordinator – Circulation & Access Services  **Harriet Mulder**, Circulation/Archives Technician  **Irene Gotz**, Reference Librarian Intern  **Jeff Piersol**, Reference Librarian Intern |
| Session #3 | 10:00-10:30am | 287 | LIBRARY STAFF - ARCHIVES/RECORDS  **Jill Patrick**, Director – Library Services  **Lynn Austin**, Archivist/Records Officer |
| Coffee break | 10:30-10:45am | Food Court |  |
| Session #4 | 10:45-11:30am | 287 | LIBRARY STAFF – SYSTEMS & TECHNICAL SERVICES  **Jim Forrester**, Head – Systems & Technical Services  **Maureen Carter**, Technical Services Librarian  **Sascha Brock**, Technical Services Library Technician  **Esther Soltau**, Acquisitions Technician |
| Session #5 | 11:30am-12:15pm | AV & Imaging  113 McCaul  1401 | AV & IMAGING SERVICES  **Eric Schwab** – Manager, AV & Imaging Services  and his staff ?  **Lino Ragno**, Image Curator/Photographer  **Martin Iskander**, AV & Mobile Computing Technician  **Janice Perrin**, Circulation/Media Library Technician  **Scott Hillis**, Assistant Image Curator  **Irene Gotz**, Temp Assistant |
| Lunch break | 12:15-1:00pm | Food Court |  |
| Session #6 | 1:00-2:00pm | WLC  113 McCaul  1501 | **Christina Halliday** – Director, Writing & Learning  Centre and her staff ?  **Lucinda Chen**, Secretary |
| Session #7 | 2:00-2:45pm | Library | FACULTY  **Richard Fung**, Integrated Media (Video for Artists, Contemporary Issues)  **George Walker**, Art (Printmaking, Book Arts, Book Design)  **Jessica Wyman**, Liberal Studies (Contemporary art, Performance studies, Documentation and historiography)  **Johanna Householder**, Integrated Media (Performance art, Contemporary issues in performance and media, Video, installation)  **Arturo Nagel**, Liberal Studies (Studio, art history, contemporary art)  **Paul Epp**, Design (Furniture, Product Design, Exhibit Design)  **Laura Millard**, Art (Abstract Painting, Contemporary Art)  STUDENTS  **Elaine Macaranas** |
| Coffee break | 2:45-3:00 | 100 McCaul |  |
| Session #8 | 3:00-4:00 | Design Office | ASSISTANT DEANS – FACULTY OF DESIGN  **Jeremy Bowes** (Environmental Design)  **Steve Quinlan** (Graphic Design) |
| Session #9 | 4:00-5:00 | Library | STUDENT presentation of Zine Collection  **Alicia Nauta**, Library Student Liaison Monitor |
| Dinner | 5:30-7:00 | Midi Bistro | **Kathy Shailer**, Acting VP Academic  **Peter Caldwell**, VP Finance & Administration |

DAY 2 – Wednesday, March 19

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Session | Time | Location | Attendees |
| Session #1a | 8:30-9:30am | 100 McCaul  Room 284 | **Peter Lashko** – Director, Facilities Planning & Management  **Veronica (Vicki) Brown** – Director, Campus Services & Security |
| Session #1b | 9:30-10:00am | 284 | **Jim Forrester**, Head – Library Systems & Tech Services |
| Session #2 | 9:30-10:45am | 284 | LIBRARY STAFF – COLLECTIONS  **Jill Patrick**, Director – Library Services  **Daniel Payne**, Head – Reference, Information & Access Services  **Robert Fabbro**, Reference & Access Services Librarian  **Maureen Carter**, Technical Services Librarian  **Topher Elliot**, Serials Technician  **Esther Soltau**, Acquisitions Technician  **Jim Forrester**, Head – Systems & Technical Services |
| Coffee break | 10:45-11:00am | Grange Bistro |  |
| Session #3 | 11:00-12:00 | 5h floor Open Studio | STUDENT PRESENTATIONS  **Matthew Nye**, Environmental Design  **Tegan Mierle**, Graphic Design  **David Chang**, Industrial Design  FACULTY (also present)  **Paul Dallas**, Design (Illustration)  **Bruce Hinds**, Design (Design Process, Interactive Design, Design Drawing, Think Tank, Biomimetics) |
| Lunch break | 12:00-1:00 | Open studio |  |
| Session #4 | 1:00-2:00pm | 284 | FACULTY  **Marie-Joseé Therrien**, Liberal Studies (Modern design and architecture, Canadian cultural history, Museum administration)  **Rudolf Bikkers**, Art (Printmaking)  **Harry Mahler**, Design (Electronic Design, Industrial Design)  **Simone Jones**, Associate Dean, Faculty of Art |
| Session #5 | 2:00-3:15 | IT Services | **Alastair Macleod** – Director, IT Services  **Michael Desjardins** – Laptop Program Project Manager  **Andrew McAllister** – Manager, Digital Studios  **Jonathan Graham** – Manager, Information Systems  **Yong Zhang** – Manager, Network Operations |
| Coffee break | 3:15-3:30pm | Grange Bistro |  |
| Session #6 | 3:30-5:00pm | 284 | FACULTY  **Gary Gray**, Design (Advertising)  **Ian Carr-Harris**, Criticism & Curatorial Practice  **Charles Reeve**, Curator, Permanent Collection, and faculty member, Liberal Arts  STUDENTS  **Shara Mohamed**  **Taimez Moslemian**  **Sue Goldstein** |

**DAY 3 – Thursday, March 20**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Session | Time | Location | Attendees |
| Session #1a | 8:30-9:00 | 5130 | **Irene Gotz**, Reference Librarian Intern  **Robert Fabbro**, Reference & Access Services Librarian |
| Session #1b | 9-10am | 51 McCaul  Student  Centre  Room 5130 | **Susan Kemp**, Student Services Administrator  STUDENTS  **Sorlie Madox**  **Leia Gore** |
| Session #2 | 10-10:30am | Room 5215 | **Susanne Seinader**, Manager, Centre for Students with Disabilities |
| Session #3 | 10:30-11:00am | Room 5130 | **Thomas Fairbairn**, Career Services Advisor  **Ted Rickard**, Manager, Health & Safety |
| Session #4 | 11:00-12:00 | 401 Faculty of Art Office | FACULTY:  **Colette Laliberte**, Drawing & Painting (Drawing, Painting, Wall work, Site Specific Installation, Oil, Gouache and Acrylic Paint)  **Claire Brunet**, Sculpture/Installation (Moldmaking/Casting, Foundry) |
| Session #5 | 12:00-1:00pm | Tour of Studios | Colette Laliberte |
| Session #6 | 1:00-2:00pm | 284 | **Michael Owen**, VP Research & Graduate Studies  **Dot Tuer**, Program Director, MA Criticism & Curatorial Practice  **Richard Smith**, Manager, Institutional Development & Analysis  **Jessica Kamphorst**, Executive Director, Development & Alumni Relations and President, OCAD Foundation  **Judith Doyle**, Integrated Media (IM, New Media, Art, Web, Mobile Technologies) |
| Session #7 | 2:00-3:00pm | 284 | FACULTY  **Archie Graham**, Liberal Studies (Asian philosophy and culture, Modern and postmodern continental European philosophy and culture; Environmentalism)  **Bruce Hinds**, Design  **Kym Pruesse**, Liberal Studies (Popular Culture, Art and Design History, Visual Activism, Art Criticism and Curatorial Practice)  **Debbie Adams**, Design (Design Communications, Environmental Graphic Design, Typography) |
| Session #8 | 3:00-3:30pm | 125 | FACULTY:  **Stan Krzyzanowski**, Material Art & Design (Fabrication Sculpture – Wood, Integrated Media, Education)  **Diane Pugen**, Art (Drawing & Painting) |
| Session #9 | 3:30-5:00 | Library | Wrap-up and exit interview  Jill, Daniel, Jim, Eric |

Attachment 2: Key questions arising from the 18-20 March 2008 interviews

*1. Identifying the rationale for investing in library space*

* Why might it be desirable for students to spend their discretionary time (i.e., time not spent in class or in fabrication facilities) on the OCAD campus? How much discretionary time do students now spend here? How much discretionary time should they spend here?
* Why is it important for students to go to the physical library, when a rapidly increasing part of the information resources they need is available in virtual space?
* What might it mean to conceive of library space as learning space? What specific learning behaviors should library space be designed to foster? How might the institution’s NSSE data be invoked in library planning and design?
* If information is now a superabundant resource and the thoughtful use of it the skill that most needs to be developed, what balance should be struck between designing library space to support transactions across service desks and to foster learning in collaboration spaces?
* Some faculty members have said “it is really hard to get students to go to the library.” Precisely what meanings does this observation have?
* In 2015, what will distinguish the library from other learning spaces at OCAD that are information rich by virtue of the availability of digital information resources? More particularly, what will differentiate library, studio, computer lab, and gallery spaces from one another?
* What might it mean to conceive of library space as celebratory space? What, specifically, should be celebrated?

*2. Setting the terms for the presence of students, faculty, and academic support staff in physical library space*

* One faculty member used the metaphor of a city square in talking about the identity of the library. What does such a metaphor imply about the relations among students, faculty, and staff in library space? How powerful is this metaphor in creating a vision of the library?
* Others used such metaphors as “cathedral,” “refuge,” and “home away from home” in talking about the identity of the library. What do these metaphors imply about the relations among students, faculty, and staff in library space? How powerful are they in creating a vision of the library?
* Several people said that OCAD studios evince key elements of the library environment they want. What are these elements, and how powerfully do they help shape a vision of the library?
* Who has the prime “ownership” claim on physical library space—students, librarians, or faculty? How might that claim be expressed or acknowledged?
* Is it important for faculty members to go to the physical library? Does OCAD need to create opportunities for students and faculty members to engage with one another outside of the classroom and the studio? If so, what character should this engagement have?
* Should faculty members have space in the library that is not normally also used by students? If so, what purpose would this space serve?
* Should a faculty development center be part of or otherwise closely related to library space?
* How should food and beverages be accommodated in the library?
* What position on the spectrum between authority figure and partner in learning do academic support staff (i.e., library, information technology, tutoring, and imaging staff) now occupy? What position do they want to have? What position should they occupy?[[4]](#footnote-4)
* OCAD information technology staff distinguish between a service support model and an academically embedded model for understanding their professional lives. In what measure are these useful models for library staff as well, and what opportunities for deep collaboration among librarians and technology staff might arise from a self-conscious effort to align the two groups around one of these models?
* To what extent and in what ways do the programmatic responsibilities of the library and those of the Writing and Learning Center and the Center for Students with Disabilities parallel one another? In what ways would students and faculty benefit from these operations occupying shared or otherwise closely related space and their staff developing strong collaborative relationships?[[5]](#footnote-5)
* In 2015, what percentage of the work done by the library’s reference and instructional staff should be done in virtual space? What percentage of their work should be done in physical space outside of the library building? In what physical spaces outside of the library building might they work?[[6]](#footnote-6)
* In 2015, what percentage of the work done by the Writing and Learning Center staff should be done in virtual space and in physical space outside of the space occupied by the Center? In what physical spaces beyond their current space might they actually work?
* What service and instructional responsibilities do Imaging Services staff have as regards students and faculty? To what extent do these responsibilities require face-to-face exchanges, and to what extent might such exchanges happen beyond the physical space assigned to Imaging Services? In what physical spaces beyond their current space might they work?
* Where should the library’s technical services staff work?

## 3. Managing the collections

* How adequately do the library’s collections (in all formats) support the New Ecology of Learning proposed for OCAD and each of the institution’s disciplines? What evidence is available to support answers to this question?
* If liberal studies and graduate programs pose collection management challenges unlike those of that past, what are those challenges (besides funding) and how will they be met?
* In those cases where the library has a choice between acquiring needed information resources in digital and analogue formats, which format will it select? Why?
* In those cases where older publications in the library’s collections become available in digital format (through, say, Google’s reformatting program), what will the library do with its analogue copy of the material? Why?
* Will OCAD undertake a significant digital reformatting program of its collections, reaching beyond the current work on images? What will be done with the analogue originals? Why?
* How will the library’s responsibility for special collections be distinguished from the collection responsibilities of the Archives, Imaging Services, and the Permanent Collections?
* What environmental and security conditions are required for the university’s collections of cultural objects, including those of all the collecting agencies (library archives, etc.)? What percentage of those collections might appropriately be kept at a location some distance from the OCAD campus?
* What opportunities exist or might be created for working with other institutions to provide high efficiency facilities for holding less frequently used library and archival collections and permanent collections of cultural objects?[[7]](#footnote-7)
* What kinds of Imaging Services material have intrinsic value, where the preservation of the material in its original format is a determining factor in how the material is managed? What is the relationship between Imaging Services and the Archives as regards such material?
* Need AV management activities and Imaging Services be co-located?

*4. Quantifying things*

* How many students will be enrolled at OCAD in 2015 and in 2035?
* What implications for the number of students who should find accommodation in library space at any given time does each of the metaphors or models considered in Section 2 have? What is that number for 2015 and 2035?
* Are there subsets of students (e.g., those in liberal studies, those with disabilities) that need special consideration in planning library space? Who and how many are they; what are their special needs?
* Are there quantifiable features of the library’s accommodation of students (e.g., large tables, scanners, lounge seating, fabrication space) that are driven by the fact that OCAD is an art and design institution heavily dependent on studio-based instruction?
* How many academic support staff will work in library space in 2015, or in space with clear programmatic connections to the library, and what kinds of work space will they require? Include as appropriate librarians, information technologists, tutoring staff, and other relevant staff in answering this question.
* What will be the size of the library’s collections in all analogue formats in 2015 and in 2035? What quantities of each of the dominant formats (monographs, bound journals, microformats, flat materials, etc.) will be held? What rationale is used in answering these questions?
* By 2015 and again by 2035, what quantity of analogue material is likely to be brought into the OCAD Archives by an effective and mature records management program? What portion of that material is likely to see frequent use? What rationale is used in answering these questions?
* By 2015 and again by 2035, what quantity of OCAD archival material will have intrinsic value, where the preservation of the record in its original format is a determining factor in the how the record is managed?
* By 2015 and again by 2035, what quantity of analogue materials that are not official records of the institution is likely to be brought into the OCAD Archives or the library’s special collections? The papers of distinguished artists, both OCAD faculty and non-faculty, ephemeral literature and other special collections, and cultural objects or the documentation of such objects created as part of the learning mission of the university are examples of what is asked about here. What collection policy will guide the acquisition of such material, and what portion of such material is likely to see frequent use? What portion of this material will have intrinsic value, where the preservation of the original format is a determining factor in how it is retained?
* By 2015 and again by 2035, what percentage of the analogue collections might be appropriately shelved in an off-campus facility? What percentages of the remaining collection might best be shelved in compact, moveable shelving, and in conventional shelving? What quantity of material should be held in other ways (film cabinets, drawers for flat material, etc.)?

## 5. Other issues

* Several students, faculty, and staff said the online tools offered by the library for finding information resources are difficult to use. What are these difficulties and how might they be addressed (through, for instance, changing the tool or more effective instruction in the use of the tool)? What priority does improving discovery tools have? Why?
* To the extent that answers to the many questions posed here require primarily design interventions, how might OCAD faculty and students be involved in devising these interventions?[[8]](#footnote-8)
* Imagine the case that provincial law or university access policy makes the use of mostly low shelving throughout the library mandatory or highly desirable. What might be done with the volumetric space above the shelves? Can this space become an asset?
* What should the library’s hours of opening be in 2015? Are there subsets of library space that should have different hours? How do decisions about hours of operation reflect institutional objectives and mission?
* What are the required service points in the library, considering all of the different staff and operations that should be included in library space? Is there a difference between the required and a desirable number of service points?
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