

CSU Libraries: Revisiting the Standards

Libraries today are facing a multitude of challenges. Many are out of space for collections, programs, and users. Many are struggling with aging facilities with infrastructure far past its useful life. All are serving customers who have escalating expectations that the library will have what they want when they want it, that technology will be available and cutting edge, and that expert help will be available. Competitors include bookstores with comfortable soft seating and coffee bars, the Internet and Google available wireless, and on-line booksellers and media distributors that deliver overnight. Additional challenges specific to the CSU Libraries include budget cuts and rapidly growing enrollment. Over one-third of students are new to campus each year and many arrive with limitations to their language, reading or writing skills. Libraries today, like retail, need to be nimble to respond quickly to change. New teaching styles, new curriculum, new student requirements, new partnerships, and service changes generated by budget cuts or emerging technologies all require library facilities to retool regularly.

The current CSU Library Space Standards are based on the 1991 Policies and Standards for CSU Campus Library Facilities. The standards are formulae driven and clarified by the following assumptions:

- CSU mission of teaching and research related to the instructional mission will require a sufficient quantity and variety of immediately available library resources
- CSU's emphasis on research related to the instructional mission will require the acquisition of basic research

materials, but not in sufficient quantities to justify special policy provisions for long term storage of such materials.

- Growth and development of library collections and access to information must be coordinated and managed to achieve the academic programs goals of the campus.
- The library facilities on each campus must support and enhance the campus' academic mission, not hinder it.
- Future CSU campus library facilities should be designed for the campus' projected enrollment ceiling thus reducing the number of times a campus needs to request a Capital Outlay Project for library construction.
- Campus library facilities should be designed to keep in step with the economy and rapidly changing technologies.
- Long range growth and development of the library collections will need to be managed within the total projected library space provided by the standards for each campus when it reaches its projected FTES enrollment ceiling.
- Existing CSU library space standards should serve as the foundation upon which to develop the new standards.

The 1996 document, Information Resource Facilities for the 21st Century: a Framework for Planning reaffirmed the use of the 1991 standards but proposed a model which reshaped them to allow individual campuses to integrate a variety of services into library building projects; i.e., integrated information resources. Up to 20% of total project space could be allocated to this category. Examples include Self Instructional Labs, Videoconferencing, Online Public Access Catalogs, and Bibliographic Instruction Classrooms.

Libraries of the California State University: Planning for Growth and Development, beautifully authored by Michael Gorman outlines the vast array of roles of the CSU Libraries and the wide variety of spaces, equipment, staff, and collections required to fulfill these responsibilities. In the introduction, Gorman quotes from the CSU Libraries Strategic Plan, which calls for “identifying and applying best practices in library design and revising building standards” to “create the next generation of learning spaces” and “transform libraries into crossroads in which successful pedagogies promote active learning.”

With that task defined, a COLD subcommittee began to address the revision of the Standards, working with Dr. Gordon Smith. Following Dr. Smith’s retirement, Stephanie Brasley took over the project and working closely with Rod Hersberger engaged a library facilities consultant to assess the current standards. This report contains preliminary recommendations based on the findings.

Data was analyzed to prepare a report on system wide and individual campus deficits of space, collection, and staff utilizing both current FTES and Master Plan FTES. Data was reviewed on the age of current facilities and the number of additions and renovations over the life of the buildings.

The findings of this study include the following:

- Today 14 libraries have a space deficit totaling 454,000 square feet
- At Master Plan Enrollment, 19 Libraries will have space deficits totaling nearly 1,600,000 ASF
- Deficit is even greater for campuses that have exceeded MPE

- No libraries meet the collection standards at 2007 FTE
- The system wide deficit in 2007 is 9,000,000 volumes
- Only two campuses meet the 2007 FTE Staff recommendations
- Systemwide the FTE Library staff deficit is 672
- Over 42% of the CSU Library space is over 20 years old; 26% is over 30 years old

In the absence of nationwide or other local planning standards the consultant used benchmarking to assess the library service levels of the CSU Libraries. Using NCES data, benchmarks were created using institutions with +/- 20% enrollment in the same Carnegie Commission Category¹. Three campuses were excluded from the study². The service measures used included two input measures, number of librarians and number of volumes held per FTE, and two output measures, weekly gate count and circulation per FTE.

The significant findings of this study include the following:

- 63% of CSU Libraries have fewer librarians than the peer group
- 63% of CSU Libraries have more volumes per FTE than the peer group
- 85% have a higher gate count, in some cases more than three times the benchmark
- 63% of CSU Libraries exceed the benchmark for circulation per FTE with Sonoma State at four times the benchmark

¹ Category M1 used for all but San Diego.

² One did not reply to the NCES survey that year; one was too new to have valid data; and one was excluded based on size.

The assessment included an on-line survey of Library Directors, individual interviews with Directors, site visits to several of the newer facilities, and review of student surveys and interviews from several campuses. The survey provided valuable information on satisfaction with current facilities and desired improvements.

The significant findings of the survey include the following:

- Information Technology is consistently rated high
- Collection storage is rated poor or fair by 50% of respondents
- Location is rated highest of physical characteristics
- Sustainability is rated low
- Quiet Space is rated either poor or fair by 78%
- Most needed spaces are Group Study and Collaborative Spaces
- Most needed improvement (and complaint) is access to electrical power even including the newest facilities
- 44% of libraries report that stacks are full

Scanning the environment of new Library Information Facilities finds many Teaching and Learning Centers and Information Commons. These spaces contain a variety of seating configurations, teaching spaces, spaces to both use and create information, zoned quiet and group study spaces, extra hours spaces, presentation and performance spaces, and flexible spaces with moveable furniture, partitions, and equipment.

New or renovated CSU Libraries include cafes, conference rooms, model classrooms, writing labs, math labs, academic computing, information technology, group study rooms, flexible space, gallery

space, faculty centers, curriculum labs, multicultural centers, and media production studios.

In the interviews, the Library Directors spoke about the planning process and how important campus involvement is in the success of a project. They talked about the current guidelines and various interpretations of the standards which enable campuses greater local control of project scope. Several spoke about the importance of investing in capital renewal and how existing space has been or is being repurposed to meet current needs. Approaches to collection management include large portions of collections and future collections being replaced with electronic information; use of the ARS as a satisfactory replacement for open stacks; weeding and keeping a vital collection; and increased resource sharing. All spoke of the key role of the library facility as a “people space” on CSU campuses, a concept that is supported by the high gate counts.

Applying the current standards

The current standards are based on formulae which allocate space by FTES for Reader Stations, Staff, Collections, and Non-Book Space. When the standards are applied, the ASF per FTE is slightly graduated from 15.64 ASF per FTE for the smallest campus down to 13.23 ASF per FTE for the largest campus.

SUAM 9614

FTE	ASF	GSF ³	Reader Stations	Reader Space	Staff	Staff Space	Collections	ASF O/S	Collection MAC	Non-Book Space	Total ASF
8,000	125,120	192,492	1,600	42,368	67	15,075	840,000	40,000	12,571	16,000	126,014.
10,000	140,800	216,615	2,000	52,960	73	16,425	940,000	40,000	15,429	16,000	140,814
12,000	167,640	257,908	2,400	63,552	81	18,225	1,060,000	48,000	16,571	19,200	165,548
14,000	193,900	298,308	2,800	74,144	89	20,025	1,170,000	56,000	17,429	22,400	189,998
15,000	207,000	318,462	3,000	79,440	93	20,925	1,225,000	60,000	17,857	24,000	202,222
18,000	245,160	377,169	3,600	95,328	115	25,875	1,390,000	72,000	19,143	28,800	241,146
20,000	270,200	415,692	4,000	105,920	130	29,250	1,500,000	80,000	20,000	32,000	267,170
25,000	330,750	508,846	5,000	132,400	160	36,000	1,775,000	100,000	22,143	40,000	330,543

Table I: Applying the Current Standards

The prescribed number of reader seats is 20% of FTES. These seats are to be divided into study tables (88% of seating at 25 ASF⁴ per seat), individual carrels (10% of seating at 35 ASF per seat), and Library Telecommunications Computer Workstations (2% of seating at 49 ASF per seat.) Staff numbers are based on projected numbers of FTE Library staff at the approved FTES enrollment level. Each

³ At 65% efficiency ratio assignable to gross square footage.

⁴ Assignable Square Feet the amount of usable or programmable space. GSF is the total square footage required which includes stairwells, lobbies, elevators, rest rooms, corridors, shafts, ducts, and the thickness of walls.

staff member is allocated 225 ASF in the total program. Librarians are allocated 150 ASF for offices and workstation space in shared offices and workrooms is significantly smaller. The remaining space is available for other staff functions including public service desks, prep rooms, staff meeting spaces, storage, and production areas. Collection space is based on the projected number of volumes at full master plan enrollment. The prescription for collections is that a minimum of 40 volumes per FTE be shelved in open stacks (at 10 volumes per ASF) and that the remainder be housed on compact shelving or in an automated retrieval system. Finally space for non-book materials is allocated at 40% of the total of open space for collections. Any additional space for audio-visual, media, or instructional development is justified at the local level and is allocated at the ratio of 10,000 ASF plus 1 square foot per FTE.

Application of these standards results in a facility that is dense with stacks. Approximately 50% of space is occupied by collections.

<i>FTEs</i>	<i>Readers</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Collections</i>
8000	34%	12%	54%
10000	38%	12%	51%
12000	38%	11%	51%
14000	39%	11%	50%
15000	39%	10%	50%
18000	40%	11%	50%
20000	40%	11%	49%
25000	40%	11%	49%

Table II: Balance of Space

The 1996 document which addressed the needs of integrated information services allowed for 20% of the total square footage to be allocated to other purposes, while 80% would be retained for traditional library purposes. This introduced a measure of flexibility to the standards allowing each campus to design a facility which meets the individual campus needs.

Discussions with the Library Directors and others involved in the planning of new or renovated facilities recommended building even greater flexibility into the standards to bring them into line with current best practices and to reflect the type of spaces that today's students require and today's technology allows.

Following is a suggested revision of the standards that removes many of the prescriptions of the 1991 standards, but still provides a context for uniformity in planning and guidelines to establish the project scope. The categories are opened up to wider interpretation allowing for greater control at the local level and greater flexibility in providing the nimble spaces needed.

Recommended Revision

FTE	ASF	GSF	Reader Stations	Reader ASF	Staff	Staff ASF	Collections	Collection ASF	Local Need	Total
8,000	129,108	194,158	1,600	48,000	67	15,075	840,000	46,667	19,366	129,108
10,000	151,350	227,607	2,000	60,000	73	16,425	940,000	52,222	22,702	151,350
12,000	175,428	263,817	2,400	72,000	81	18,225	1,060,000	58,889	26,314	175,428
14,000	198,853	299,044	2,800	84,000	89	20,025	1,170,000	65,000	29,828	198,853
15,000	210,565	316,658	3,000	90,000	93	20,925	1,225,000	68,056	31,585	210,565
18,000	248,350	373,480	3,600	108,000	115	25,875	1,390,000	77,222	37,252	248,350
20,000	273,627	411,494	4,000	120,000	130	29,250	1,500,000	83,333	41,044	273,627
25,000	334,836	503,543	5,000	150,000	160	36,000	1,775,000	98,611	50,225	334,836

Table III: Recommended Revision to 1991 Standards

Reader Seats: Retain the 20% requirement, but expand this category to include all varieties of seating – lounge, carrel, table, group study, conference room, meeting room, instructional space, gallery space with benches, etc. Allocate an equal amount of 30 ASF to each. A table for four or a carrel is as likely to have laptops as an LTCW. With flat screen monitors and laptops, 49 ASF is not required for owned equipment. Net change is an increase in reader seat space for all campus sizes.

Staff space: The current standards are adequate and broad enough to include a range of job titles and descriptions. No net change in staff space.

Collections: Keep the current collection sizes. Even with the 9,000,000 volume deficit, the CSU Libraries generally have more volumes per capita than peer institutions. The ratio of open stack to MAC or ARS can be decided locally, but the total amount of space for collections should not be exceeded unless specifically identified in the Local Campus Need (See Below). The space for collections is calculated at 18 volumes per ASF. The current allocation of 10 volumes per ASF is extremely generous; public libraries have used 15 volumes per ASF for years and this is adequate for most collections with the exception of medical, legal and bound

journals. Few CSU libraries have extensive collections in these areas and bound journals are among the first to be placed on compact shelving units.

Table IV below illustrates the application of the recommended revision. Campus FTE enrollment requires a collection count of 1,060,000 for an enrollment of 12,000 FTES. At 40 volumes on open stack for 12,000 FTES, the open stack requirement is for 480,000 volumes. At 15 volumes per square foot, the open stack space requirement is for 32,000 assignable square feet. The remaining 580,000 volumes, if housed on compact shelving will utilize 16,571 ASF, leaving 10,317 ASF “Extra M” for non-book or other collection purposes. If the remaining 580,000 volumes are located in an ARS, which will require 5,800 ASF, then the “Extra A” space for other collection purposes is 21,089 ASF.

Net change is a reduction in collection space, but sufficient space is available to house the 40 volumes per FTE on open shelves. Unused stack space can be used for display or exhibit until such a time as they are required for collections. Any space not utilized by collections can be reverted to Reader Space or Local Campus Need. (See below)

<i>FTEs</i>	<i>Total Collection</i>	<i>Total ASF</i>	<i>Vols on O/S</i>	<i>O/S ASF</i>	<i>Vols on MAC/ARS</i>	<i>MAC ASF</i>	<i>Extra (M)</i>	<i>ARS ASF</i>	<i>Extra (A)</i>
8,000	840,000	46,667	320,000	21,333	520,000	14,857	10,476		
10,000	940,000	52,222	400,000	26,667	540,000	15,429	10,127	5,400	20,156
12,000	1,060,000	58,889	480,000	32,000	580,000	16,571	10,317	5,800	21,089
14,000	1,170,000	65,000	560,000	37,333	610,000	17,429	10,238	6,100	21,567
15,000	1,225,000	68,056	600,000	40,000	625,000	17,857	10,198	6,250	21,806
18,000	1,390,000	77,222	720,000	48,000	670,000	19,143	10,079	6,700	22,522
20,000	1,500,000	83,333	800,000	53,333	700,000	20,000	10,000	7,000	23,000
25,000	1,775,000	98,611	1,000,000	66,667	775,000	22,143	9,802	7,750	24,194

Table IV: Collection Space Utilization in Revised Guideline

Non-book space: This category is eliminated and incorporated into total collection space. See Table IV above for Extra (M) using moveable aisle compact shelving and Extra (A) using ARS storage facilities. Non-print is increasingly housed in virtual space, which is not included in the space standards.

Local Campus Need: This space at 15% of the total ASF is available for a specific local campus need identified in the library building program and plan of service. Examples of campus facilities that can be included in the library’s vision include the Faculty Development Center, Archives, Center for Excellence, Writing Lab, Reading Lab, or Multicultural Center. The Standards for Campus Development mandate that each campus have a 1,200 seat auditorium and an initial 3,000 square foot art gallery. If these are justified in the library program, then they might be included in Local Campus Need. If programs included in the project are not included in the library’s plan of service, then that space is either not inventoried as library space or classified as temporary tenants.

Temporary Tenants: Current policy should continue that the university may locate other occupants in surge space for a campus that has not reached master plan enrollment. Policy includes that the space must be available to the library for purposes as noted above when that space is required. A timeline for relocation can be employed.

The total space change requirement for library space is approximately 2 to 7 % increase in space per project if the new guidelines are implemented.

<i>FTES</i>	<i>Space Increase</i>
8,000	2%
10,000	7%
12,000	6%
14,000	5%
15,000	4%
18,000	3%
20,000	2%
25,000	1%

Table V: Increase in Space Requirement

The revised guidelines change the balance of the space with a higher percentage allocated to readers and local need. The percentage of space allocated to collections decreases as the size of the FTES and collection size increases based on a greater number of volumes being housed in MAC or ARS storage.

<i>FTES</i>	<i>Readers</i>	<i>Staff</i>	<i>Collections</i>	<i>Local Campus Need</i>
8,000	37%	12%	36%	15%
10,000	40%	11%	35%	15%
12,000	41%	10%	34%	15%
14,000	42%	10%	33%	15%
15,000	43%	10%	32%	15%
18,000	43%	10%	31%	15%
20,000	44%	11%	30%	15%
25,000	45%	11%	29%	15%

Table VI: Balance of Space Revised Guidelines

COLD Presentation

At the November meeting in San Jose, the consultant will present the results of her study and this draft recommendation for discussion. A draft outline of a Best Practices will be distributed for review. Future expansion of the guidelines will include renovation or capital renewal projects.