Academic Library Services' Response to *External Reviewers' Report,*
Joyner Library Program Review, June 19, 2013
Response Submitted August 8, 2013 by Janice S. Lewis, Interim Dean,
on behalf of the unit

1. Introduction of the Site Visitor(s)

The faculty, staff and administration of Joyner Library deeply appreciate the willingness of Mr. John Ulmschneider, Team Leader (University Librarian, Virginia Commonwealth University), Ms. Kathlin L. Ray, External Reviewer (Dean of Libraries and Teaching and Learning Technologies, University of Nevada, Reno) and Dr. Robert A. Chin, Internal Reviewer (Professor, Department of Technology Systems, East Carolina University) to serve as program reviewers for Joyner Library. It was clear that the reviewers were committed to the integrity of the process and were diligent in their responsibility to examine the Library's self-assessment of its success in serving the teaching, learning, information, and research needs of the university community, and to validate the findings or raise questions and identify issues where appropriate. As with any external report, there are some statements that may reflect incomplete information or a misunderstanding of the information received. In this response, the unit will point out these instances, provide correct information, address all recommendations, and enunciate plans of action. The unit notes that the development and enunciation of action plans is complicated by the need to collaborate with another unit, the William E. Laupus Health Sciences Library, on the development of some of the plans.

2. Overview of the Site Visit Process
  a. Materials received for the review visit: Two East Carolina University Program Review: Administrative and Support Units self-study reports - one for Joyner Library and another for Laupus Health Sciences Library
  b. Materials obtained during the site visit that were needed to complete the review process and/or write the report: Self-study report, Library web site, detailed charge from the senior administrative team of East Carolina University
  Response from the unit
  The external program review team noted that it did not have the time or opportunity to fully explore the range of issues raised in the charge document or the additional charge elements. The unit would like to provide additional information here on four of the five specific issues raised by the senior administrative team. The fifth issue - treatment of staff members by faculty librarians - will be discussed later in the report.
  1) The senior administrative team asked the Joyner team to address this specific issue: "Why would administrative technology staff have to have a degree in library science and be designated as faculty members?" The unit notes that not all "administrative technology staff" are in fact required to have a degree in library science and not all are designated as faculty members. A degree in library science was not required when Academic Library Services (ALS) advertised for an Assistant Director for Library Technology in the summer of 2012, although this

position was designated as a faculty position. Unfortunately, this was a failed search. The Head of IT Operations does not have a degree in library science and is not a faculty member. He successfully served as interim Assistant Director for Library Technology for a year until the decision was made to reorganize this area under the leadership of an existing Assistant Director and use the vacant Assistant Director for Library Technology position for another purpose. Technology affects every aspect of academic libraries. ALS, like other academic libraries, has numerous technology-related positions in multiple departments. Some of these positions are SPA and some are faculty, depending on the specific responsibilities of the position and the required qualifications. The unit notes that on page 5 of the report, the review team found that "There is high interest in innovative information technology solutions to meet new and emerging needs" and suggests that this comment speaks well of its current balance of position types.

2) The senior administrative team asked the Joyner team to address the specific issue "What leave policy is in effect in Joyner Library, and can it be justified?" On May 16, 2013, interim dean Janice S. Lewis provided this information to the senior administrative team.

3) The senior administrative team asked the Joyner team to address the specific issue "Why does Joyner not employ a liaison model to faculty department similar to that of Laupus Library?" The unit notes that the most recent structural change to our liaison model was intended to provide consistent approaches to collection management across multiple subject areas and and to provide for more intensive analysis and active management of the collections. We feel fortunate that we did have fulltime collection managers to deal with budget cuts and try out new acquisitions models during the four years since this structural change. Title-by-title selection of ebooks, patron-driven acquisition of ebooks, and patron-driven acquisition of print books have all been developed under our current liaison model. While we believe that our current liaison model has been largely successful, we are quite willing to engage with Laupus librarians to discover strengths of their liaison model and to share strengths of ours.

4) The senior administrative team asked the Joyner team to address the specific issue "What is Joyner's long-term vision for Collections? Are they weeding resources that are no longer necessary?" Joyner Library's long-term vision for collections is rooted in its mission and vision statements. We are committed to the continued development of robust collections that will ensure that Joyner Library remains the intellectual heart of ECU by effectively serving the varying needs of ECU's campus and distance education communities. To fulfill this long-term vision while also meeting users' needs to quickly access specific resources, the unit is pursuing a combination of collection development strategies that are rooted in the subject expertise of collection managers. One component of these strategies has been the implementation of patron-driven acquisition models in which resource acquisitions are initiated through user demand. We are currently assessing the effects of these models on other acquisition types (specifically firm order and approval plans). As we look to the future, we are committed to retaining the right balance of selection types and evenness of coverage through the advanced planning and expertise of knowledgeable collection managers and input from faculty and students.

c. Strengths/weaknesses of the review process (contacts, visits, preparation, etc.)

Response from the unit

The unit believes that adding another day to the reviewers' visit would have provided the opportunity for them to have developed a greater understanding of Joyner Library's collections and its instruction program - two areas where there seemed to be some misunderstandings. Also, if the unit had received a copy of the charge in advance, it could have provided the reviewers with additional documentation which would have assisted their work.

3. Basic Characteristics/Description of the Program Under Review at ECU
Response from the unit

The unit notes that on page 4 of the report, the reviewers cite the combined size of the ECU Libraries' staff, even though the self-study included specific figures for Joyner Library only.

4. General Narrative (with examples)
a. Strengths of the program or process under review
Response from the unit

The unit appreciates the review team's recognition of the excellent customer service provided to all constituencies and stakeholders by its talented and dedicated librarians and staff, as well as its focus on creating excellent library facilities. The reviewers noted that "constituents highlighted the benefit to students and faculty of adding academic support services into Joyner Library, such as the writing center and tutoring services" but that teaching faculty and some students expressed apprehension about the effect of non-library services on noise levels and space for collections. The unit notes that it recognized the stress and noise caused by the success and growth of the Pirate Tutoring Center (PTC) and worked successfully with the PTC, the Division of Academic Affairs, and ECU Facilities Services to move the PTC out of Joyner Library during the summer of 2012. The other services located in Joyner Library - the Pirate CAVE MathLab, Project STEPP, the University Writing Center, and the Office for Faculty Excellence - do not cause the same noise or disruption as the PTC and offer numerous opportunities for positive collaborations.

b. Concern or Inconsistencies with Mission and/or Objectives
Response from the unit

The ALS mission statement already addresses research, as it states that we "support ECU's contributions to the research community worldwide." Research support is also implicit in statements in the mission that Joyner Library is the intellectual heart of East Carolina University, connects people to information, and has robust collections. ALS's vision statement implicitly addresses research in its statements that "we will remove barriers between people and information" and "will be a catalyst for positive change in eastern North Carolina." However, explicit use of the word "research" would make this responsibility clearer. The unit will consider modifying its vision statement during upcoming strategic planning. At this time, the unit does not see a need to revise its Values statement, which was compiled following a facilitated library-wide workshop.

c. Recommendations for improvement
1. Overall strategic planning
Response from the unit

Academic Library Services has consciously framed its goals, priorities, and planning on documents from the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL), including that organization's bi-annual identification of top trends affecting academic libraries, its biennial environmental scans, the *Value of Academic Libraries* report, as well as ACRL reports on research data services, scholarly communication, and other topics. ALS uses ACRL standards, including but not limited to those for information literacy competency, distance learning, special collections, and curriculum materials centers during planning and assessment of those areas. The ACRL *Standards for Libraries in Higher Education* have also been used for assessment purposes. ACRL "is dedicated to enhancing the ability of academic library and information professionals to serve the information needs of the higher education community and to improve learning, teaching, and research," making it the most appropriate source for standards and best practices for ALS. Of course, ALS faculty and staff also incorporate standards, best practices, and innovations from other sources, e.g., other divisions of the American Library Association (Library Information Technology Association, Library Leadership and Management Association, Association for Library Collections and Technical Services, and Reference and User Services Association), the Society of American Archivists, the North Carolina Library Association, the Librarian Orientation Exchange, the North American Serials Interest Group, and the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). ARL is a nonprofit organization of 125 research libraries in the United States and Canada. Membership is based on the research nature of the library and the parent institution's Carnegie classification as a Research University with high or very high research activity, or by comparable affiliations or documentation. Since East Carolina University's Carnegie classification is a DRU (Doctoral/Research University), ALS does not qualify for ARL membership. While not all of the services and information available from ARL are directly applicable to ALS, quite a lot are. Among these are statistics and assessment, copyright and fair use, scholarly communication, open access, and the LibValue initiative. One of the reviewers (Mr. Ulmschneider) spontaneously mentioned ARL several times during the visit; ALS faculty and staff do not recall comparing Joyner Library with ARL institutions, other than in terms of the LibQUAL+ survey results. This survey was originated by ARL but is now used by all types of academic libraries worldwide.

On the question of whether ALS may wish to revise and refine its mission/vision/values statement to align it more closely with ECU's Carnegie classification as a Doctoral/Research University (DRU) with a high undergraduate enrollment, the unit wishes to point out that VCU, University of Nevada-Reno, and many other research universities also have "high undergraduate" enrollment profiles. According to the Carnegie Foundation, this classification merely means that graduate/professional students account for 10-24 percent of FTE enrollment. In addition, the list of institutions ECU selected as its peers includes only two institutions with a DRU classification but 13 with an RU/H (Research University/High Research Activity) classification, as well as three aspirational peers that have an RU/VH (Research University/Very High Research Activity) classification. According to the IPAR website, the peer institutions selected by ECU "are meant to be a meaningful comparison group, with a mixture of comparable peers and aspirational peers." Carnegie's three categories for doctorate-granting universities are based on the aggregate level of research activity and the per-capita research activity at the university. Through its selection of peer institutions and its current strategic action plan, ECU has

sent a clear signal to ALS, campus, UNC General Administration, and the public that its goal is to increase its aggregate and per-capita research activity. Specifically, ECU's 2010-2013 strategic action plan includes the following items:

- Advance the frontiers of knowledge through investment in basic, applied, and pedagogical research and scholarship.
    - Substantially increase support for research and graduate programs that are tied to UNC-GA's and ECU's highest priorities, among them STEM.
    - Increase external funding to support research that addresses North Carolina's PK-12 challenges.
    - Accelerate our efforts to create an environment that is highly conducive to research.
- Lead and foster partnerships that fuel innovation, entrepreneurship, and knowledge transfer throughout the region.
    - Enhance support to faculty, staff, and students seeking to discover, develop, transfer, and commercialize knowledge.
    - Strengthen research and creative productivity, the engine for innovation, entrepreneurship, and economic development for the region.

Like all ECU units, ALS tied its strategic plan and goals for 2010-2013 to the ECU strategic action plan, including the portions noted above, which stressed research. If ECU modifies its research aspirations, ALS will of course modify its goals in the future as necessary to support ECU's goals and strategic plan.

Unit Action Plan for Recommendation Regarding Overall Strategic Planning

Respond to changes in the ECU mission statement and new ECU strategic action plan, when finalized, by making appropriate changes to the ALS mission and vision statements if needed, to the existing ALS strategic action plan if needed, and to future strategic plans and goals documents. Develop and implement mechanisms for obtaining and incorporating input from ECU faculty, administrators, and students. Timeline will depend on when the new ECU mission statement and strategic action plan are finalized and made available.

2. Special Collections
Response from the unit

Section 4.c.2 states that Special Collections and its associated cataloging unit in Technical Services had "a large organizational footprint, including significant assignment of library assets." The review team concludes that the asset base for Special Collections "appeared excessive" and that the "role of Special Collections in the library and on campus can be better defined." Suggestions include a more strategic approach to future direction, collection foci, and resource demands, the merging of service desks; a more focused and purposeful approach to digitization; and collaborative strategic planning with Laupus Library.

The Special Collections Division consists of four departments: Manuscripts and Rare Books, North Carolina Collection, University Archives and Records Management, and Digital Collections. Manuscripts and Rare Books and the North Carolina Collection maintain service points. Cataloging and metadata services for each of these departments are provided by the

Special Collections Cataloging Department in the Discovery and Technology Division (formerly Collections and Technical Services). Special Collections Cataloging also provides metadata for the Teaching Resources Center and the Institutional Repository, and maintains data integrity across the library catalog via participation in the national Name Authority Cooperative Program and other activities. Of the department's eight main focus areas in 2012-2013, only four related to the Special Collections Division. Considering the variety of responsibilities of the department and its staff, the unit does not currently deem the footprint of the Special Collections Cataloging Department to be excessive.

The Special Collections Division recognizes the need to revisit the strategic plan of the division regularly. It plans to re-examine the division's vision and strategy in order to bring them more in line with those of Joyner Library and the university. This would include shifting the division's focus and balance of activities from collection development to academic engagement. Prospective strategies for consideration include consolidating to a single service desk, revisiting collection development policies to ensure that they are in line with the learning and research needs of the university, assessing collections to set priorities for processing, digitization, and conservation, optimizing storage efficiencies, identifying strengths and gaps in collections, and shifting staff duties to include public service as well as collection responsibilities.

The Special Collections Division in Joyner Library has collaborated with the Laupus History Collections and is open to further collaboration. In the past year, we have advised Laupus Library History Collections and the Country Doctor Museum on developing finding aids that can be included in our manuscript guide portal. This is an ongoing project. Digital Collections has also worked with Laupus Library History Collections and the Country Doctor Museum to include their materials in the digital collections repository. Special Collections intends to discuss future collaborations and possible consolidation of departments and service points.

Unit Action Plan for Recommendation Regarding Special Collections

1. The Special Collections Division will develop a strategy statement which includes statements on learning and research, access and discovery, customer service, public engagement, collections, innovation and sustainability, income and finance, and marketing and communications. A strategy statement will be drafted and approved by December 15, 2013.

2. The Special Collections Division will consider the benefits and problems with combining service points. A plan was developed in 2011 to combine service points but was never implemented. Costs of consolidating to a single service desk and of continuing with two desks will be considered. A decision will be made by December 15, 2013.

3. Manuscripts and Rare Books and the North Carolina Collection will conduct collection assessments on all collections to set processing priorities, digitization priorities and conservation priorities. The assessments will be completed by June 30, 2014.

4. Discussion of a merger and consolidation of special collections in Joyner and Laupus Libraries will be a part of the upcoming joint strategic planning of the two libraries.

5. Other actions, including shifting staff duties to include service responsibilities and reconsideration of collection development policies, will be contingent upon the decision to combine service points and the results of the collection assessments.

3. Technical Services
Response from the unit

Section 4.c.3 ("Technical Services") notes that "The review team concluded that Technical Services … likely is larger than necessary for the size of the library acquisitions budget at ECU. An analysis of current processes and a 'value stream' assessment may be very helpful."

In response to the review team's recommendation, the Unit Action Plan includes steps to review work processes and staffing levels for increased effectiveness. Such a review will be particularly useful in light of a recent reorganization of technical services and information technology departments into two new divisions, Acquisitions & Collection Management and Discovery & Technology Services. This reorganization, which occurred in July 2013, provides the opportunity to consolidate processes and streamline workflows. This reorganization is occurring in conjunction with ongoing efforts to achieve efficiencies in technical services functions through enhanced collaboration with personnel at Laupus Library.

The report further states that "It appears that the monographic acquisitions rate may be overly high for a library of this size with a primarily undergraduate teaching mission. Since circulation data in the self-study shows a steady decline in checkouts, a review of book use data and comparison of monograph acquisitions with peer benchmarks may prove helpful in targeting an appropriate level of monograph acquisitions."

An analysis of monograph spending indicates that ALS is in line with peer institutions (both DRU and RU/H categories). The unit has already begun a shift of emphasis, having noted ourselves these trends in circulation data, to more demand driven acquisitions strategies. This will continue and is part of the Action Plan, along with a revised allocation formula that is evidence-based.

A final observation in this section recommends that "Both the Joyner and Laupus review teams observed that it is reasonable to expect that a single technical services operation can handle book and journal orders, catalog management, and related tasks for both libraries. Substantial efficiencies are possible in this area. Merger of the two technical services units represents 'low hanging fruit' for the library system and the university."

Increased collaboration between the technical services departments at Joyner and Laupus Libraries has been and will continue to be an area of significant focus for the libraries. This collaboration is rooted in the libraries' shared management of the Virtual Library fund (used for acquisitions of e-resources collections that are of significant value to users at both libraries) and the libraries' shared instance of the SirsiDynix Symphony integrated library system. Over recent years, technical services personnel at Joyner and Laupus Libraries have been particularly active in building on these foundations for collaboration. For example, during the summer and fall of 2012, Joyner and Laupus technical services personnel collaborated to develop enhanced tools and workflows for the tracking and resolution of e-resource error reports. Likewise, personnel from both libraries collaborate in the administration of next generation collection discovery services and recently partnered to develop a shared ECU Libraries web page.

Looking forward, technical services personnel at both libraries are working proactively to further enhance the collaborative partnerships between the libraries. For example, e-resource

managers at both libraries are collaborating on the implementation of an open-source e-resource management system that will reduce costs by approximately $20,000 a year while also streamlining and consolidating certain e-resource workflows between the libraries. Further, as the libraries continue to assess the needs of users, technical services personnel at both libraries will play an essential role in the collaborative assessment and likely implementation of next generation systems, with an eye towards both cost savings and enhanced capabilities.

But even given this strong emphasis on collaboration between Joyner and Laupus technical services departments, a formal merger of these departments is currently not feasible due to the separate administrative frameworks in which Joyner and Laupus personnel operate. A true merger of Joyner and Laupus technical services departments only seems likely if there were first an administrative merger of Joyner and Laupus units. However, as noted in section 2.c of the program review report, "a decision ha[s] been made about an administrative merger of the two libraries, and that the option ha[s] been taken off the table" by ECU's senior administrative team.

Unit Action Plan for Recommendations Regarding Technical Services

1. Review work processes and staffing levels for increased effectiveness, particularly in light of the reorganization of technical services and information technology departments into two new divisions.
Timeline: Current and anticipated position vacancies and other factors will influence decisions, along with Laupus collaborations that need to be considered; the unit estimates that this process will take 18 months to two years.

2. Adjust funding allocations for monographic purchasing based on recently developed evidence-based model and expand demand driven plans. Continue analysis of book usage to inform this process.
Timeline: Current fiscal year, July 2013-June 2014

3. Drawing on the input and recommendations of the proposed Joyner/Laupus technical services working group (see "Unit Action Plan for Recommendations Regarding Administrative Relationship Between Joyner and Laupus") continue collaboration with Laupus technical services and actively pursue synergies as possible.
Timeline: Ongoing

4. Library space
Response from the unit

Section 4.c.4 ("Library space") recommends that Joyner Library address collection storage space issues, focusing on an Automated Storage and Retrieval System (ASRS) and high-density off-site storage. Recommendation is also given to proceed with "judicious deselection" of books from the circulating stacks. While the unit disagrees with the characterization of Joyner Library as having a "primarily undergraduate teaching mission," we recognize the need to manage physical collections skillfully and with input from departmental faculty. To that end, ALS has created the most flexibility in library space through rigorous review and withdrawals of bound journals meeting certain criteria. One-time funding is regularly used for

the acquisition of online journal archives, which provide a basis for the deselection of print volumes. ALS also regularly reviews bound journals that might be moved to the Closed Compact stacks (roughly 500 shelves of journals were moved there in summer 2013). Within the last few years, collection managers have only undertaken weeding of monographs in targeted areas, and have invited department faculty input on those collections decisions. When the time comes to deselect monographs in the future we will again invite their input.

The program review report states that "Joyner Library needs to lay the groundwork of educating ECU's teaching faculty on the value of off-site storage." The unit points out that, in response to evidence of space needs provided by ALS, the February 2012 ECU master plan included an on-site automated storage and retrieval system (ASRS). According to the master plan, design work is scheduled for 2023 and construction for 2024 and 2025. ALS began educating faculty on the value of an on-site ASRS during the spring of 2013 by writing an "elevator speech" and gaining support from the Faculty Senate Libraries Committee.

Unit Action Plan for Recommendation Regarding Library Space

While ALS currently prefers an on-site ASRS and has reasonably been making plans for and educating faculty about such a facility based on its inclusion in the ECU master plan, the unit accepts the reviewers' recommendation that it "carry out a rigorous cost-modeling exploration of different alternatives for book storage, including ASRS and high-density off-site storage." Its action plan will be to appoint a task force including representatives from ALS, Laupus Library, and either ECU IPAR or ECU Facilities Services to investigate costs and alternatives and issue a report to the Dean of ALS and the Director of Laupus Library by May 1, 2014. The Dean of ALS and Director of Laupus Library will make a recommendation to the Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences by June 30, 2014. Joyner's collection managers will continue to monitor available space for physical collections, balancing continued growth with selective withdrawals only on an as-needed basis. When monograph weeding becomes necessary we will seek input from departmental faculty.

5. Library collections
Response from the unit

Section 4.c.5 ("Library Collections") suggests the need to "intensify" selective discarding activity "due to severely overcrowded stacks." There are specific areas in the general collections where space is tight—for instance, the B's on the second floor—but these are offset by available space elsewhere in the stacks and by regular journal deselection, as described above. The unit understands that in the future it will need to weed monographs, and will do so using established criteria and with input from departmental faculty.

Section 4.c.5 also notes that "Non-recurring year-end funding over the past several years has ameliorated the impact of reductions and forestalled large reductions in the subscription base." The report goes on to recommend that the university strengthen funding for library acquisitions to prevent significant cancellations of journal subscriptions. It is certainly accurate that ALS has suffered deep cuts to its materials budget. Indeed, over the past four years, the materials budget has been reduced by approximately 25 percent. Concurrently, inflation rates for journal subscriptions have continued their rapid rates of annual increase (generally in the range

of 5 to 8 percent). In the face of such trends, it is clear that, if library materials funding is not significantly bolstered, major reductions in journal access will soon be necessary. However, the report is inaccurate in its statement that non-recurring year-end funding has been used by ALS as a means to forestall subscription cancellations. Instead, the materials budgets cuts have been absorbed through the library's effective and well planned collection and budget management practices. Year-end funding has been directed primarily toward the one-time acquisition of e-resources that fill significant gaps in the library's holdings and/or that enable the library to address space issues through the deselection of print materials based on perpetual rights for online access.

Unit Action Plan for Recommendation Regarding Library Collections

As mentioned above, ALS collection managers will seek input from departmental faculty on targeted deselection projects when they become necessary, and will continue on an annual basis to evaluate bound journals. The unit also urges campus administration to provide new permanent funds in order to forestall significant losses of access to scholarly content needed to support research and teaching at the university. The unit estimates that costs for renewals of the library's current subscriptions will increase by $248,000 for fiscal year 2013-2014, and $315,500 above that for fiscal year 2014-2015. Interim Dean Lewis will provide university administration more detailed information about current subscriptions and about the estimates of additional permanent funding needs by November 1, 2013.

5. Other programmatic recommendations based on comparison/contrast of ECU with other universities' programs and service delivery models

1. Unit code controversy

Response from the unit

The ALS Faculty Affairs committee provided the following response: It remains the considered opinion of the ECU library faculty that the tenure-track faculty model is the best one for the ECU community, its libraries, and its librarians. While library faculty members continue to support the current code model, alternative hiring models have been provided when requested by ECU administrators. The Faculty Affairs committee has provided research in the form of an environmental scan of library hiring models in the *Preliminary Report to the Interim Dean*, which was shared with the Provost and Vice Chancellor in August 2012, as well as the document entitled, *Proposed Code Model for ECU Libraries*, on March 1, 2013. The faculty of Joyner Library agrees with the review team's observation that a solution must be reached soon regarding the unit code issue and faculty status for librarians at East Carolina University. Joyner library faculty approve of the review team's interim solution whereby ECU Libraries are allowed to recruit some key positions as tenure-track, with others as fixed-term positions, and accept it as a potential model for consideration as a permanent solution to the unit code issue. Additionally, the faculty agrees with the review team's response calling for multi-year fixed term appointments to be considered. Joyner's librarians look forward to working toward a resolution to the unit code issue in partnership with Laupus Library, Provost Sheerer, Vice Chancellor Horns,

and Chancellor Ballard in the near future.

Unit Action Plan for Recommendation Regarding Unit Code Controversy

This action plan is dependent on actions and decisions by the Chancellor and other members of the university administration. The unit is committed to working collegially to develop and implement a plan that is fair to all categories of EPA personnel, that rewards excellence, that helps develop leaders and that contributes to a successful and strong unit.

2. Faculty-staff relations

Response from the unit

The unit accepts in part the review team's statement "that a rigid adherence to the MLS degree as a required credential for librarians hampers the library's ability to recruit outstanding talent; compromises its goals for diversity and inclusive excellence by ruling out alternative preparation and background that might distinguish diverse candidates; and engenders disharmony and resentment among paraprofessional staff who do not hold the MLS but might hold graduate credentials useful to the library and the university in a faculty librarian position." However, the unit would substitute the term "faculty" for the term "librarians" and "faculty librarian" in this sentence. This change in wording is consistent with the statement modified and reaffirmed by the ACRL Board of Directors in 2011 that the master's degree from a program accredited by the American Library Association or international equivalent is the appropriate terminal professional degree for academic librarians. The unit notes that it has one faculty member who does not have an MLS (but has a Ph.D. in History) and several EPA employees who have graduate degrees other than the MLS.

The unit also notes that at the July 17 and July 25, 2013 SPA Assembly meetings, those present indicated that they felt that their session with the external reviewers was a positive meeting at which they "showed pride in Joyner and in their jobs." They indicated that at the session, the majority of the staff that have advanced degrees stated that they understand the credentials for faculty are necessary, but are hopeful in this changing climate that new positions will be evaluated in order to provide staff with opportunities to advance, as well as use their education to fulfill the mission of Joyner Library and the University as a whole. Many members of the staff expressed surprise that their positive comments and the current changes being made at the library were not reflected in the report.

Unit Action Plan for Recommendation Regarding Faculty-Staff Relations

The unit is committed to improving faculty-staff relations. Discussions at Library Assembly and SPA Assembly meetings subsequent to the receipt of the program review report have helped all employees understand the concerns that have been expressed. The interim dean has had individual and group conversations with faculty and SPA and has indicated to all groups that the concerns must be addressed. The unit's initial action has been to ask the leadership of the Library Assembly and the SPA Assembly to jointly recommend steps that will improve the working environment. Following receipt of those recommendations, a more detailed action plan will be developed by October 15, 2013. The plan will include the active participation of both faculty and SPA. By May 1, 2014, the staff climate survey that was first administered in the

spring of 2013 (or a similar survey) will be administered and responses compared to document any improvements or ongoing problems. In addition, every EPA position that becomes vacant will be examined by the Dean's Executive Committee and the Faculty Personnel Committee to determine whether the position is critical to the unit, and if so, the appropriate terminal degree for the position and whether the position should be EPA Faculty or EPA Non-Faculty.

The unit has a salary plan in place for SPA employees, and will act upon it when state limitations are lifted. The unit will continue to regularly evaluate SPA classifications and work with staff to increase competency levels as required by the position in order to advance.

3. Administrative relationship between Joyner and Laupus
Response from the unit

In section I.4.a. of the report, the reviewers noted that Joyner has a highly collaborative relationship with Laupus Health Sciences Library. We look forward to expanding our collaborations into even more areas in the future.

Unit Action Plan for Recommendation Regarding Administrative Relationship Between Joyner and Laupus

ALS suggests that the two units set up working groups to discuss planning for the areas listed in the report: scholarly communication (report bullet points 1-3), technical services, liaison models, special collections, and library development. ALS also suggests that the working group currently addressing differences in Circulation and Interlibrary Loan procedures continue its work and be recognized as part of the joint planning process. All working groups should be established by October 1, 2013 and should make recommendations to the Joyner and Laupus administrations by April 1, 2014.

6. Appendices
a. The list of attendees at the Administrative Staff (SPA) meeting should be corrected as follows:
- Change Cynthia Gooch to Cynthia Sharp
- Add Christopher Hodges
- Add Misty Joyner

The meeting with the Dean's Executive Committee was omitted from the appendix.
Attendees were:
- Eleanor Cook
- Kacy Guill
- Christopher Hodges
- Jeanne Hoover
- Mark Sanders