C3: CONVIVIAL CAPABILITIES CHECKLIST

Capability of access

- ☐ Physical access—Is the tool/system physically available, findable, reachable, comprehensible, usable?*
    - ☐ For a variety of ages, skills, and interests?
    - ☐ Are there policies blocking access for users:
        - ☐ Time limits
        - ☐ Age limits
        - ☐ Storage limits
        - ☐ Physical ability limits
    - ☐ Why are policies/procedures in place that block physical access?
        - ☐ What assumptions are underneath these policies/procedures?
        - ☐ How can these be remediated?
- ☐ Intellectual access—do users have the necessary literacies to use the tool/system?
- ☐ Or is the tool/system simple enough for most people to understand intuitively—and are you SURE it can be intuited by all?
    - ☐ Who is responsible for ensuring that intellectual or cognitive access?
    - ☐ What forms of education are available?
    - ☐ What other forms could be included to reach people of a variety of learning styles or with different levels of extent knowledge?
- ☐ What resources are available to ensure intellectual access:
    - ☐ Funding
    - ☐ Marketing
    - ☐ Outreach
    - ☐ Staff training
    - ☐ Community Training
    - ☐ Community Partnerships
    - ☐ Peer-learning among users or word-of-mouth
    - ☐ Other?
    - ☐ How else might the library ensure the capability of access: intellectual AND physical?
- ☐ Are there inequities in access OR use—especially that line up with historic socioeconomic inequities?
- ☐ Sociocultural access (See the *Capability of Understanding* to explore this capability)

* Mathiesen, K. (2014). Facets of access: A conceptual and standard threats analysis. *iConference 2014 Proceedings*. https://goo.gl/8CFKQJ

Capability of understanding—oneself and one's needs in the context of the space

- ☐ Sociocultural access: Is the tool/system comprehensible? In the contexts of the users' lives? —all sorts of lives?*
- ☐ Has the institution/system done outreach to an array of audiences, both likely and unlikely?
    - ☐ What forms of outreach are done to assist sensemaking?
    - ☐ Which audiences are being targeted? Why them? Which others can be included?
- ☐ Has the institution framed the tool/system multiple ways?
    - ☐ Are there clear signs? Manuals? How visible is this orienting information?
    - ☐ Do people need to ASK to acquire information? How can the library reduce the need to ask?
    - ☐ Is the language in orientation, wayfinding, and sensemaking varied to meet a variety of user needs and backgrounds?
- ☐ Is it clear that the tool/system may flex to meet a variety of needs or life contexts?
    - ☐ Which contexts are highlighted?
    - ☐ Why those contexts?
- ☐ Have the various user groups been consulted about their own contexts, needs, ways of making sense of the service, and the ends to which they would like to put the service?

- How can these questions be asked of more people and with greater specificity?
- [ ] What resources are available to ensure understanding:
  - [ ] Funding
  - [ ] Marketing
  - [ ] Outreach
  - [ ] Staff training
  - [ ] Community training
  - [ ] Community partnerships
  - [ ] Peer-learning among users or word-of-mouth
  - [ ] Other?
- [ ] How else might the library ensure the capability of understanding?

Capability of trusting

- [ ] Do users trust the system?
  - [ ] Where does the trust appear intact?
  - [ ] Where does it break down?
  - [ ] How can trust in staff/the institution be bolstered?
  - [ ] What about NON-USERS and their sense of trust?
  - [ ] What forms of outreach or information-gathering could be done to assess trust among a variety of user groups and non-users?
  - [ ] Are policies/procedures in place that reflect a lack of trust? Can these be revisited?
- [ ] Do the people who create or implement the tool/system trust the users?
  - [ ] Where does the trust appear intact?
  - [ ] Where does it break down?
  - [ ] How can trust be bolstered?
  - [ ] Are policies/procedures in place that reflect a lack of trust? Can these be revisited?
  - [ ] What forms of staff training could be leveraged to increase social trust?
- [ ] Do the users involved in the library trust each other?
  - [ ] What factors play a role in distrust?
  - [ ] Which factors appear to increase trust among community members?
  - [ ] Are there policies/procedures in place that foment distrust or appear to encourage social trust?
- [ ] What value is the library placing on social trust?
  - [ ] Is building social trust a part of the library's mission?
  - [ ] Why is trust important for the library (or not important)?
  - [ ] Why might it be important for the users (or not important)?
  - [ ] What programs and services might encourage this trust?
  - [ ] What levels of trust does the library share with other community organizations (governmental departments, local businesses, non-profits, etc.)
  - [ ] Would developing trust between organizations benefit the library and/or its users?
- [ ] How can the system increase or leverage social trust and/or social capital to build trust?
- [ ] How else might the library ensure the capability of trusting?

Capability of acting (rather than being acted-upon)

- [ ] Are the users of the space able to act rather than be acted upon?
  - [ ] Is there a hidden curriculum framing how and why users are "supposed"' to use the spaces?
  - [ ] Can users make their own decisions about the tool/system's use or the things they do with it?
  - [ ] Is the corporate or institutional framing of the tool/system such that it forecloses other ideas of how to use the tool/system?
  - [ ] Does the corporate or institutional framing of the system only highlight some ends to which the tool/system is put, while ignoring or marginalizing others?
  - [ ] How ELSE might the tool/service/system be framed to ensure that other outcomes are possible in its use?
  - [ ] What values are encoded within the framings that exist about the tool/service, which may prescribe

particular outcomes?

- ☐ Are those library values?
- ☐ Are they funder values?
- ☐ Are they community values?
- ☐ Are they individual values?
- ☐ What other values might be considered?

Subcapability: Having some type of say in what occurred in these spaces

- ☐ Feedback from users—are there STRUCTURED ways for users to respond to the system/tool/service?
- ☐ Are there opportunities for shared governance of particular spaces/programs/services?
  - ☐ How does the library identify who will share in this governance?
  - ☐ Are these opportunities open for a wide array of community members, including those who are often marginalized?

Subcapability: Being able to give of one's own expertise in the spaces

- ☐ Can users make the tool/system better for themselves or others?
- ☐ Can users train others in the use of the tool/system or share knowledge?
- ☐ Are there structured ways to include community experts into the development of the programs/services/tools? (e.g. mentorships, "maker-in-residence" opportunities, "check out the local expert" information exchanges, etc.)
  - ☐ If local experts are sought after, are there ways to ensure these community members can engage with one another if they choose to?
  - ☐ What resources are made available to them?
  - ☐ Are there ways for community experts to teach or lead within the library?
    - ☐ What policies/procedures limit these connections (for example, are volunteer efforts stymied by background checks? Is there a way around that barrier?)
- ☐ Are there systems in place to proactively build user-centered enrichment, and to sustain it?

Subcapability: Balancing needed help and institutional control and the range of contingencies possible in the spaces

- ☐ Can users fail?
  - ☐ How is failure treated withing this system?
  - ☐ What feedback loops are possible in assisting or learning from failure?
  - ☐ Are staff trained to allow for failure?
- ☐ Can users succeed?
  - ☐ Is there feedback to ensure users know success has occurred?
  - ☐ How is success framed for this tool/service?
  - ☐ How is success built upon in this system/tool, so further success is possible?
- ☐ Are staff trained in ensuring that the outcomes the user desires are supported by the service/tool/staff?
- ☐ Do the people who create or control the system take over the use of the tool/system from the users?

Capability of choosing (specifically, one's means and ends)

- ☐ Can users accomplish goals THEY consider important?
- ☐ Are a range of outcomes possible?
- ☐ Are a range of styles of interaction possible?
- ☐ Do you support both serious and casual leisure?
  - ☐ Are there at-will independent opportunities for self-starters?
  - ☐ Is there storage?
  - ☐ Do you structurally support ways for serious leisure people to build community?
  - ☐ Do you have programs for casual leisure use?
  - ☐ Do you value casual leisure use?
  - ☐ Are you NOT considering the casual leisure use as a way to "level up," but rather valuing play as an end in itself?

Capability of coexisting and connecting

- ☐ Are people interacting and forming relationships with other people?
- ☐ Do they want to do so—and at what level?
    - ☐ Do they want to interact on a deep level (i.e. make friends)?
    - ☐ Do they want more shallow connections—such as seeing what others do with the tool/system, or simply enjoying coexisting with others in the space?
    - ☐ Do they want to include existing friends or relationships within the tool/service?
    - ☐ Do people want to learn from one another?
    - ☐ Do they want to be inspired by one another?
    - ☐ Do they want to "show off" to one another?
    - ☐ Do they wish to teach or lead one another?
- ☐ Are there structures in place within the tool/system to proactively build community, and to sustain it?
    - ☐ What technologies could assist with connections? (e.g. people checking in on a computer and saying what they are working on in a makerspace, projecting that information so others can find people working on similar projects)
    - ☐ What low-tech solutions could assist (e.g. instead of using a computer and projects, would post-it notes on the wall help?)
    - ☐ Are there opportunities to "show and tell" among users?
    - ☐ Are there opportunities for peer feedback?
- ☐ Are library staff trained to be "enzymatic": breaking down barriers between users, introducing people who may want to connect, being radically welcoming to newcomers?
- ☐ Do users want clubs or other structured social activities?
    - ☐ Are there any mentorship possibilities?
    - ☐ What clubs or semi-formal groups might be formed to support community connections?
    - ☐ Are there peer-learning and peer-teaching opportunities?
    - ☐ Are staff trained to moderate withing peer-learning, feedback, or other "connective" activities?
- ☐ What value do users place on social connections?
- ☐ What value does the library place on social connections?
- ☐ Are there issues around shared resources?
    - ☐ Have users been included in discussions about the best ways to share resources?
    - ☐ Are ALA guidelines regarding equitable access being followed? (See also the Capability of Access)
    - ☐ How are staff trained to address conflicts in resource sharing?
        - ☐ What leeway is staff allowed to make to facilitate resource sharing?
        - ☐ Is that leeway built into policies/procedures?

Capability of Adapting (or making oneself comfortable in the environment)

- ☐ Can users adapt the tool/system/room to their needs?
- ☐ Or are they expected to change themselves to fit the space—whether it's their disposition that is expected to change or their body?
- ☐ Are they comfortable—what can be changed to make them more comfortable?
    - ☐ Sound
    - ☐ Touch
    - ☐ Light
    - ☐ Scent
    - ☐ Temperature
    - ☐ Sense of security
    - ☐ Disposition/personality
- ☐ Are there a variety of seating and table options?
- ☐ Are certain people more comfortable than others? Why?
- ☐ Is the library staff trained to break down relational inequities between "experts" and "nonexperts" as a way to ease any dispositional discomfort?
- ☐ Can the library provide familiarity of projects/tools for a wide array of people?