Visiting Team Report:
Program Review for Administrative and Support Units

Joyner Library

East Carolina University
Greenville, NC 27858-4353

Prepared by:

Mr. John Ulmschneider, Team Chair
University Librarian, Virginia Commonwealth University

Ms. Kathlin L. Ray, External Reviewer
Dean of Libraries and Teaching and Learning Technologies, University of Nevada Reno

Dr. Robert A. Chin, Internal Reviewer
Professor, Department of Technology Systems, East Carolina University

April 12-15, 2013

Joyner Library Program Review
External Reviewers' Report
June 19, 2013

1. Introduction of the Site Visitor(s):

Robert A. Chin, Professor, Department of Technology Systems, College of Technology and Computer Science, East Carolina University. In addition, Chin is a member of the ECU and Indiana State University graduate faculties. He is active in the American Society for Engineering Education as a member of the Engineering Design Graphics Division's Executive Committee and is the Engineering Design Graphic Journal's Editor. He is also a member of the Association of Technology, Management, and Applied Engineering Executive Board and is a trained accreditation visiting team chair and team member.

Kathlin L. Ray, Dean of Libraries and Teaching & Learning Technologies at the University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada's Tier I land-grant research-extensive university. Ms. Ray is the administrator for multiple units including the pioneering Mathewson-IGT Knowledge Center and DeLaMare Science and Engineering Library. Active in national and regional professional organizations, Ms. Ray currently serves on the board of trustees for LYRASIS and is a member of the LINK+ executive committee. Previously the university librarian at the American University of Sharjah, United Arab Emirates, Ms. Ray engaged in international efforts to build academic libraries in the Middle East and headed a Mellon funded grant to study student information-seeking behaviors at four American universities in the Middle East and in Europe. Ms. Ray has also held positions at the University of the Pacific and Brigham Young University.

John E. Ulmschneider, University Librarian, Virginia Commonwealth University. Mr. Ulmschneider directs a research library enterprise with annual expenditures exceeding $17 million, a staff of 135+, and holdings exceeding 2.3 million volumes with more than 50,000 journal subscriptions. Mr. Ulmschneider is past-president and Board member of the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL), comprising the 39 largest academic research libraries in the Southeast; a member of the Virtual Library of Virginia (VIVA) Steering Committee, chair of its Outreach Committee, and a key leader in advocacy supporting its funding; Chair of the Legislative Committee of the Virginia Library Association; past member of the OCLC Member's Council and User's Council; past Board member for SOLINET (now LYRASIS) and chair of its finance committee; and current president of the Richmond Academic Library Consortium (RALC.) Mr. Ulmschneider also recently concluded an 8-year term as a Trustee of the Richmond Public Library Board, and was Chair of the Board from 2006-2008. He was recognized by the UNC-Chapel Hill School of Information and Library Science as a Distinguished Alumni in December 2011. Mr. Ulmschneider previously held positions at North Carolina State University, the College of William and Mary, and the National Library of Medicine.

2. Overview of the Site Visit Process

East Carolina University is served by two libraries: the J. Y. Joyner Library (including its Music Library branch) serves the main campus, while the William E. Laupus Health Sciences Library serves the Health Sciences campus. These libraries operate largely on an independent basis with significant levels of collaboration in specific areas such as providing digital resources to the entire University community. As a result, two Library Review Committees were retained. This Report provides a qualitative assessment regarding the accuracy of the Joyner Library self-study report prepared by its staff, faculty, and the administration. In addition, this report addresses specific Joyner Library review committee charges and charges of a more general nature that both review committees were asked to address.

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 the Laupus Health Sciences Library.

b. **Materials obtained during the site visit that were needed to complete the review process and/or write the report.**

A comprehensive self-study of the Joyner Library dated April 1, 2013 was compiled by a cross-section of library managers, faculty and staff. The study includes a glossary, organization charts, assessment data, peer comparisons and other supporting documentation. The external review committee received the self-study prior to its on site visit, May 13-15, 2013. The self-study and the library web site provided reviewers with detailed information about library collections, operations, programs and services.

On the first day of the site visit, the review committee received a detailed charge from the senior administrative team, consisting of Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Dr. Marilyn Sheerer; Vice Chancellor for Health Sciences Dr. Phyllis Horns; and Dr. Ron Mitchelson, Interim Vice Chancellor for Research. The charge to the two committees requested that the committees consider how the libraries are responding to dramatic changes in the information landscape and how the libraries may need to change in response to evolving needs of various stakeholders. More specifically, the charge contained the following questions:

1. How are basic services such as research and instruction likely to change over the next several years in response to the evolving digital landscape and evolving habits of faculty and students?

2. How can the work of the library (on issues such as scholarly communications, internal processes, direct support of students/faculty, etc.) be improved through the use of advances in technology?

3. How will the role of collections shift over the next decade, particularly in response to changes in digital information resources? What changes will be required for space of the physical collection, access to digital collections and the efficient access to materials not owned by the library?

4. What changes will need to occur to our staffing patterns to better achieve the library's goals over the next decade? How are the roles and responsibilities of librarians changing; what new competencies will be needed? How will staff at all levels need to adapt to changing work roles and the need for additional skills?

5. What generalized changes should we plan for the use of current library space, including public areas, staff areas, and areas that house library collections?

6. What modifications will be required to the library's resources (budget, space, staff, skills, systems, and decision-making environment) must the University consider to best position the library for success, while also helping strengthen East Carolina's academic programs in challenging economic times?

In addition to this general charge, the senior administrative team asked the Joyner team to address these specific issues:

1. Why would administrative technology staff have to have a degree in library science and be designated as faculty members?

2. What leave policy is in effect in Joyner Library, and can it be justified?

3. There have been complaints from staff member in Joyner Library that that are not treated well by faculty librarians.

4. Why does Joyner not employ a liaison model to faculty department similar to that of Laupus Library?

5. What is Joyner's long-term vision for Collections? Are they weeding resources that are no longer necessary?

An external program review typically serves to review the institutional self-study rather than explore questions requiring significant additional investigation. As external reviewers, we have endeavored 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. While this report will attempt to address many of the previous questions listed, the review team did not have the time or opportunity to fully explore the range of issues raised in the charge document or the additional charge elements.

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

The entire review process was well organized and thoughtfully designed. The self-study was thorough and delivered in adequate time for close reading by the review time. The logistics for the review team visit (transportation, lodging, and the like) were smooth and trouble-free for the reviewers. The review team found that the arranged interview sessions included all appropriate constituent and stakeholder groups and did not feel the need to add other interviews. The team commends ECU on the thoroughness of preparation and the rigor of the process.

The team identified a challenge in the on-site visit schedule. Interview sessions with constituent and stakeholder groups were scheduled back-to-back with no breaks throughout the entire day, not even a restroom break. Besides the inconvenience to the review team members, the schedule risked communicating an unfortunate message to constituents and stakeholders. Each constituent or stakeholder group was allotted a specific length of time, and members of those groups graciously made themselves available for that time. In return, they reasonably expected to have the full time allotted to them, along with the undivided attention of the review team members. However, a packed schedule inevitably led to delayed starts for some groups or abbreviated sessions for others as groups rotated out, as reviewers took necessary (very short) breaks, and the like. These small stumbles -- the review team made every effort to minimize them – might have communicated to some groups that in the rush of the schedule, their input was less important than the input of others.

The review team also found an unexpected element in the charge to the team. No members of the team knew until seeing the charge on the morning of May 13, the first day of the visit, that a decision had been made about an administrative merger of the two libraries, and that the option had been taken off the table. As the visit progressed, it appeared also that the staff in both libraries didn't realize that decision had been made. In the concluding session of the visit, Provost Sheerer noted that normally, no one knows the charge that is communicated except the leadership and the visiting team. Consequently, under normal circumstances, the library staff would not have been expected to know the substance of the charge. The Provost also noted that the visiting team normally receives its charge orally.

3. Basic Characteristics/Description of the Program Under Review at East Carolina University (ECU)

The East Carolina University program reviewed: J.Y. Joyner Library.

J.Y. Joyner Library, and its Music Library branch in the A.J. Fletcher Music Center, is the largest library east of Raleigh and offers state-of-the-art research services and resources. The East Carolina University library system, including Laupus Health Sciences Library, constitutes a significant research library enterprise in North Carolina and the region. Among the 38 libraries comprising the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL, http://www.aserl.org), ECU's libraries reported expenditures of $16,312,507 for fiscal year 2011-12, ranking the libraries 22 in total expenditures. According to ASERL statistics, the extensive collections include more than 2.4 million volumes, supported by a staff of 58 professional staff and 107 support staff, for a total of 203 FTE throughout the library system. The review team concurs in self-study findings regarding the funding, collections size, and staffing of Joyner Library: overall, the library appears to have an adequate-to-strong asset base for its mission.

Joyner Library's Exhibitions and Special Events: Joyner Library supports a robust special collections operation that includes two major units, the North Carolina Collection and the Manuscripts, Rare Books, and University Archives. The size of the special collections units is distinctive among libraries similar in size and scope to Joyner. In addition, throughout the year Joyner Library hosts special events that highlight its collections and the broader ECU and East Carolina community. From the library's "About" page: "The library is more than a place which houses books. It's about providing an enriched environment for scholarship, collaboration, and socializing. We appreciate the opportunity to showcase the talents and hard work of East Carolina's students and faculty while giving the community another opportunity to experience art, culture, history, and connection. We continue to strive to maintain a balance of user-centered focus as well as community engagement."

Mission Statement: From the library's "About" page on the web: "Joyner Library is the intellectual heart of East Carolina University. We serve ECU's campus and distance education communities, acts as a resource for the people of eastern North Carolina, and supports ECU's contributions to the research community worldwide. We connect people to information and empowers their lifelong learning by developing robust collections, superior services, and people-friendly spaces."

Vision Statement: From the library's "About" page on the web: "Joyner Library will be a dynamic leader among academic libraries. We will engage students, faculty, and staff in their learning environments and daily lives. Through our quality collections, innovative services and collaborative workspaces, we will remove barriers between people and information. Library services to distant learners will be a notable national model. Joyner Library will acquire and preserve unique collections, including those documenting regional history and culture, and our digitalization program will make them available worldwide. Through strong partnerships with libraries, educators, and the private sector, Joyner Library will be a catalyst for positive change in eastern North Carolina."

Values: From the library's "About" page on the web: "Here at Joyner Library we value

- Service
- Respect for others
- Life-long learning
- Information access
- A robust collection
- Privacy
- Collaboration
- Leadership roles
- Innovation
- Open communication
- Accountability
- Empowerment

- Diversity
- Safety
- Fun!"

Joyner Library "About" page: http://media.lib.ecu.edu/development/AboutJoyner.cfm

Joyner Library history: http://media.lib.ecu.edu/archives/bldg_history.cfm?id=66

4. General Narrative (with examples)

a. Strengths of the program or process under review

Excellent customer service: The review team found that all constituencies and stakeholders report that a key strength of Joyner Library is its talented and dedicated librarians and staff. All constituents find that the staff has a deep and well-informed commitment to excellent customer service. Teaching faculty view librarians as respected and knowledgeable campus colleagues and value their active involvement in the instructional mission of the university. Librarians are integrated into the curriculum in multiple ways including teaching students how to do library research and use primary sources. ECU's teaching faculty is also very satisfied with the library's scholarly resources (books, journals, databases, and the like). The review team was somewhat surprised by this finding, given the reduced acquisition of library materials required by recent budget reductions. Cutbacks seem to be offset by the library's excellent service ethic and quick interlibrary loan turnaround times. Students and community members also report very high levels of satisfaction with library services, facilities and staff.

Focus on creating excellent library facilities: A second key strength is Joyner's emphasis on student-centered facilities and services. Joyner provides dozens of group study rooms and collaboration spaces as well as quiet study areas, hundreds of computers, a coffee shop, generous evening and weekend hours and multiple service desks. Constituents highlighted the benefit to students and faculty of adding academic support services into Joyner Library, such as the writing center and tutoring services. Teaching faculty and some students did express apprehension about the effect of non-library services on noise levels and space for collections.

Other areas of strength:
- Evidence-based service design, as demonstrated by Joyner's use of results from LibQual+ surveys, campus surveys and onsite interviews.
- Highly collaborative relationship with Laupus Health Sciences Library.
- Transparent governance structure; trust is high throughout the organization.
- Excellent collegiality among library faculty. (Note: there is evidence of staff-faculty tensions, described in 4.c below.)
- A well-designed digitization program that focuses on unique and rare materials; the program facilitates discovery and access of ECU's distinctive materials, and increases the visibility of ECU and Joyner Library to academic enterprise worldwide.
- Music Library aligned with and responsive to faculty needs: there is evidence that the Music Library is a cherished resource because of its close attention to meeting both the collection and facilities needs of faculty and students.
- Strong outreach programs to campus and East Carolina region.
- Successful library assessment and continuous improvement programs.
- Administrative support for exploration of new ideas and risk-taking; the evidence suggests an agile, responsive, and creative library faculty in many areas. There is high interest in innovative information technology solutions to meet new and emerging needs.

- Staff has the opportunity to advance by earning an MLS at no cost through NC Online University. Several library faculty who started in Joyner Library as SPA employees earned an MLS and were then hired into library faculty positions.
- Staffing levels for both SPA and library faculty employees is strong compared with peer libraries.
- The budget for library acquisitions is healthy as compared with peer libraries. However, recent reductions call into question whether Joyner can continue to provide adequate collections for the university community. See 4.c below.

b. Concerns or Inconsistencies with Mission and/or Objectives

Services, initiatives, and collections in Joyner Library appear consistent with the mission and objectives of the library as expressed in the self-study and on the library's web pages.

The review team did find that the library's goals, priorities, and planning appear largely to reflect issues of concern among large research libraries, especially the community of libraries holding membership in the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). However, the mission/vision/values statement gives little attention to research enterprise and focuses on educational and community engagement. This apparent disconnect is addressed in Section 4.c.

c. Recommendations for improvement

1) Overall strategic planning
Given the apparent difference between its mission/vision/values statement and its overall strategic thinking, Joyner Library may wish to revise and refine its mission/vision/values statement to align it more closely with ECU's Carnegie classification as a DRU (Doctoral/Research University) with a high undergraduate enrollment. A strategic focus on issues of concern among Association of Research Libraries (ARL) institutions may not be appropriate, since all ARL institutions are either Carnegie RU/H [Research University/High Research Activity] or Carnegie RU/VH [Research University/Very High Research Activity).

2) Special Collections
Special Collections (North Carolina Collections, Manuscripts and Rare Books and Archives & Records) and its associated cataloging, metadata and authorities unit in technical services have a large organizational footprint, including significant assignment of library assets (staff, time, funds, and space). The review team concluded that the asset base for Special Collections appeared excessive for the mission of Joyner and a library of its size. The review team also concluded that the role of Special Collections in the library and on the campus can be better defined.

It appears that a more strategic approach is needed to determine the role and ranking of Special Collections in library and university priorities, its future direction, its collection foci, and resource demands. Stated bluntly, can the library afford to maintain such a heavy special collections focus in light of emerging needs such as data management? The merging of service desks and other back of house operations is an obvious first step. The review team also recommends a more focused and purposeful approach to the digitization of special collections materials. Finally, this is an area ripe for collaborative strategic planning with Laupus Library. A merger and consolidation of special collections in the two libraries holds out promise for significant efficiencies as well as synergies in collecting and cultural programming.

3) Technical Services
The review team concluded that Technical Services – that area of the library responsible for acquiring library materials, processing them, ensuring bibliographic records are maintained, etc. – 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. 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.

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.

4) Library space
As described in the self-study, Joyner Library needs to address collection storage space issues. However, it appears that Joyner Library needs to lay the groundwork of educating ECU's teaching faculty on the value of off-site storage; the review team found that the teaching faculty are opposed to any realistic solutions to easing overcrowded manuscripts, archives, and book storage areas. Among possible solutions to the collections storage issue, the self-study report places considerable emphasis on an Automated Storage and Retrieval System (ASRS). The review team recognizes that such systems are used by many libraries, but also cautions that an ASRS is very expensive and not appropriate in many circumstances. Many large research libraries use high-density, off-site storage to achieve equal cost-per-book storage costs. The review team recommends that Joyner Library carry out a rigorous cost-modeling exploration of different alternatives for book storage, including ASRS and high-density off-site storage. In addition, the library should create a mechanism to educate faculty and initiate dialog on this issue. Off-site storage of library materials is a common practice among contemporary research libraries, so Joyner's initiatives in this area are aligned with prevailing profession practice. In addition, the judicious deselection of books particularly in Joyner's circulating collections is a standard practice for libraries with a primarily undergraduate teaching mission. The cost of keeping unused and outdated materials on the shelf is prohibitive and counterproductive. By engaging in a well-designed education and advocacy effort, Joyner should be able to implement mainstream practices with respect to resolving their needs for additional collection space.

5) Library collections
It appears that Joyner Library monitors the use of its collections and selectively discards volumes when appropriate but due to severely overcrowded stacks, this activity may need to be intensified. The visiting team finds that the decline in funding in recent years for acquiring library materials, particularly funding to cover unavoidable, contractually-obligated cost increases in journal subscriptions, may shortly become a significant challenge for access to the scholarly record by ECU faculty and students. Nonrecurring year-end funding over the past several years has ameliorated the impact of reductions and forestalled large reductions in the subscription base. However, these temporary patches leave the university vulnerable to the implications of a smaller continuing budget for library acquisitions that now forms the base budget for the library. The visiting team recommends that the university identify the extent to which it should strengthen the continuing budget for library acquisitions to avoid deep reductions in journal subscriptions.

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

1) Unit code controversy
The review team believes that the university must soon design and implement a solution for the unit code controversy that has consumed so much time and energy in Joyner Library and across the entire university

community. The review team found that the university process to date on this issue has undermined morale and compromised the ability of the university to implement significant change in the short term. The review team recommends that the university look to an interim solution that will allow Joyner Library to hire needed staff, while working towards a permanent solution over the next two years. The optimal interim solution will allow recruitment of some positions as regular tenure-track faculty, identical to existing tenure-track faculty positions in Joyner. The libraries appear to have a good internal process for identifying strategic priorities and recommending which positions might be recruited.

The review team's notes on this issue from the exit "joint information sharing/brainstorming" session on May 15 provides useful context and expands on its recommendation.

Key points from joint information sharing/brainstorming session on the unit code decision:

- The Provost introduced the issue of faculty status and reported that it is her conclusion, from all that she has heard from library staff and the program review teams, that there is no single accepted practice for how librarians are treated in faculty models.
- The Provost reported that she has not received an answer to her original question to Joyner faculty: are there other faculty models that ECU might explore?
- The Joyner program review team noted that part of the reason for the lack of an answer stems from the concern of library faculty regarding fixed-term appointments. They believe fixed term appointments undermine their ability to build a strong faculty because applicants will not apply for positions that have only a one-year appointment. However, the Provost noted that fixed-term appointments are commonplace at ECU: the department of English, for example, has a faculty that is 50% tenured and 50% fixed-term faculty.
- The Provost explained that fixed-term appointments have always formed part of the overall makeup of the faculty. These appointments give the university a degree of agility and efficiency in managing its budget. Fixed term appointments can be eliminated more easily if budgets are reduced, and therefore support the university's overall strategic goal of protecting tenure-track faculty lines. She noted that unlike in other academic units, most faculty positions in Joyner are tenured, which can make it difficult to meet budget targets on the personnel side of the ledger. (The director of Joyner noted that the library has managed its budgets to meet budget targets in the past, even with high proportion of faculty lines.)
- Evidence exists to suggest that alternatives to the tenure-track model for libraries will work. This includes evidence at ECU itself from positions in both libraries, and evidence at other UNC system schools. The assertions of Joyner staff about the necessity of tenure-track status for attracting librarians to ECU and Greenville do not appear to have evidence to support them.
- One member of the program review team suggested that the university describe fixed term appointments more positively, and avoid presenting those appointments primarily as a financial management tool. Multi-year fixed appointments should also be considered.
- Both program review teams concurred that the Laupus model for newly hired library faculty – providing a choice between a fixed term appointment or a tenure track appointment – holds promise as a long-term solution for ECU. That model is rooted in the assumption that are some new faculty who wish to pursue tenure, and some who don't, but both types of appointments are valuable to the faculty as a whole. The goal is to recognize faculty who wish to be part of the larger faculty process by seeking tenure, but not penalize faculty who do not. The director of Laupus noted that tenure positions provide the opportunity to define those with "senior status" among the faculty.
- Both review teams and the brainstorming session clarified that there are four methods to appoint faculty librarians at ECU.

  - Tenure-track faculty lines
  - Fixed-term appointments with faculty status but not tenure

- Multi-year or continuing fixed-term appointments with faculty status, with rank, but without tenure (this is the approach taken by Virginia Commonwealth University)
- EPA professional positions (this is the approach taken by NC State and UNC-CH)

- One team member noted that if there are compensation differences between these different appointment types, applicants will have a financial incentive to choose one over the other. In addition, the compensation differences between positions handling similar responsibility loads and scope will raise questions and affect morale.
- The review team confirmed that Joyner Library faculty member are permitted "research leave" to carry out research or scholarly writing. The leave in implemented through an internal policy developed as part of the transition of library faculty appointments from a 10-month appointment to a 12-month appointment. It does not appear that Laupus Library shares this policy and it is not an official university policy, although it has long had the sanction of the ECU leadership.
- Both program review teams reported that library faculty are concerned that a change in faculty status indicates that ECU has begun to consider its libraries a "support unit" rather than an "academic unit." The university leadership may need to take special steps to reassure the university community that its libraries remain an integral part of academic enterprise.

2) Faculty-staff relations
The review team found that the credentialing requirements for library faculty positions were perceived by some paraprofessional (SPA) staff as a barrier to advancement, since some of those staff have advanced degrees but not the MLS. The team also found that some SPA staff felt slighted by professional librarians and reported episodes of disrespect by faculty librarians towards SPA staff.

In the course of discussing this issue with staff, the review team discovered that a number of professional librarians at Joyner displayed considerable disrespect for these concerns among SPA staff. In more than one setting, professional librarians dismissed the concerns as rooted in individual circumstances or in inter-personal relationships. Some professional librarians also openly stated that SPA staff who expressed these concerns simply did not wish to "put in the work" necessary to earn the proper credentials, and concluded that their complaints did not have legitimate standing.

These observations indicate that the Joyner library faculty appears to harbor some disrespect for SPA staff. The review team recommends that Joyner Library immediately address SPA staff concerns and with full respect for the validity of the concerns and for the staff who have expressed themselves. The faculty and library leadership must take the SPA concerns seriously, take steps to address them, and not dismiss or explain away the concerns.

One possible approach to addressing the issue of career advancement is to adopt a growing practice among research libraries of requiring a graduate degree to stand as a candidate for a library faculty position, but not necessarily require the MLS degree. The review team believes 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.

3) Administrative relationship between Joyner and Laupus
The two review teams did not come to a shared opinion regarding the benefits of an administrative merger of Joyner and Laupus libraries. The Joyner team sees great potential in a merger; the Laupus team did not have a consensus on merger, although one member of the Laupus team noted that the current model of separate institutions is the optimal solution. Nationally, there are a variety of successful models.

Although not in agreement on merger, the two teams did identify several areas in which closer collaboration or possible merger of operations might bring greater efficiencies to library operations at the university.

- Work on issues of copyright, intellectual policy, digital repositories, and digital publication should be planned and carried out jointly, by both libraries, in order to provide consistent, pan-university guidance to faculty.
- Research data curation is inherently cross-departmental and cross-campus in nature. It will require the involvement of teaching and research faculty, librarians, information technology experts, and others to advance a coherent program.
- Data mining and database management initiatives also require broad cross-campus collaboration.
- Planning for technical services in libraries. As noted in 4.c above, both review teams observed that a single technical services operation can handle book and journal orders, catalog management, and related tasks for both libraries.
- Liaison model planning. Both review teams noted that the health science library community has developed strong, responsive and well-designed liaison models. A collaborative approach to designing and implementing a liaison program will bring that experience and expertise to Joyner, and also will be enriched by the different community needs on East Campus of ECU.
- Special collections. Both review teams agreed that the ECU libraries should plan together for the vision and mission of special collections. As noted in 4.c above, the total resource base devoted to special collections should be reviewed particularly to ensure that the investments align with and are justified by university priorities. A merger of the two special collections should be explored.
- Strategic focus on library development activities. Both review teams agreed that the two libraries should jointly plan fund-raising efforts to ensure they develop appropriate goals, agree on donor targets and minimize overlap and duplication.

In addition to these areas, the Joyner review team noted that an administrative merger of Laupus and Joyner libraries into a single library system holds significant promise for better and more efficient coordination of library assets across the entire institution. The administrative merger of professional and "main" libraries is an ongoing and accelerating trend at universities nationally for this reason. In North Carolina, UNC-CH has merged the health sciences and "main" library into one unit; the merger of Augusta State University and the Medical College of Georgia resulted in the merger of the libraries at each institution; Emory University has adopted a joint reporting model; the University of Florida recently merged its medical and "main" library system; and the University at Buffalo, Virginia Commonwealth University, and other institutions have long existed as joint operations. These examples, along with many others, demonstrate that such mergers are possible, can work well, and do not compromise the work or professional culture of the libraries in merged institution.

6. Appendices

a. Lists of attendees (faculty, deans, etc.) of constituent groups who provided information during the review site visit

Monday, May 13

Administrative Staff (SPA), 9:30-10:30A

Ramona Okechukwa, Serials
Luella Wills, Cataloging & Metadata
Amy Smith, Teaching Resources Center

Margaret Earley-Thiele, Teaching Resources Center
Melissa Williams
Dawn Wainwright

Amanda Vinogradov
Jill Gooch
Cynthia Gooch
Rita Khazanie
Debbie Cobb
Delores Reeves
Wendi Mair
Glenna Lemasters
Mary Sweatte
Michael Tucker
Pam Evans
Tracie Hampton
Crystal Morgan
Gloria Bradshaw

Patricia Crandall
Rebecca Harrison
Jackie Cannon
Rossa Davis
Holly Harris
Ken Harbit
Joe Rolison
Arthur Carlson
Lou Rook
Dawn Rook
Carol Wade
Judy Barber
Martha Elmore
Lynette Lundin

East Campus Deans, 10:40-11:40A

Richard Eakin   Paul Gemperline   Chris Buddo

Tenured Faculty, 1:15-2:15P

Dale Sauter   Lisa Barricella   Matt Reynolds
Patricia Dragon   Hazel Walker   C. William Gee
David Durant   Linda Teel   Alan Bailey
David Hursh, Music Library
Eleanor Cook, Professor, AD for Coll & Tech Services
Carolyn Willis, Associate Professor, Research & Instructional Services
Mark Sanders, Public Services
Jan Mayo, Collection & Tech Services, General Collections Cataloging
Ralph Scott, Manuscripts & Rare Books, Special Collections

Internal Constituents, 2:15-3:15P

Christopher Locklear, Academic Affairs   Mark Sprague
Karen Smith, Student Transitions   Andrew Morehead
Katie O'Connor, EC Scholars/Honors College   John Tucker
Wendy Sharer, English/Quality Enhancement   Robert Campbell
    Plan   Ginny Sconiers
Cheryl McFadden   Belinda Patterson

Tenure-Track Faculty, 3:15-4:15P

Ginny Boyer   Patrick Carr   Kathryn Kavanagh
Jeanne Hoover   Susan Holland   Cindy Shirkey
Angela Whitehurst   Kacy Guill

ECU Department Chairs (East Campus), 4:15-5:15P

Gerald Prokopowicz, History   John B. Harer, Library Sciences
Randy Daniel, Anthropology   Vivian Mott, College of Education

Burrell Montz, Geography

Tuesday, May 14

Fixed-Term Faculty/EPA Non-Teaching Faculty, 8:00-9:00A

Ann Stocks   Virginia Bacon
Jennifer Joyner   David Hisle

External Constituents, 9:00-10:00A

Juanita Midgette, ECSU, Director
Beth Rowe, UNC Personal LIB
Ann Schwarzmann, Advancement Council, Friends of Joyner Library
Liz Sparrow, Friends of Joyner Library
Harry Stubbs, Joyner Library Advancement Council
Michael Priddy, Joyner Library Advancement Council

Joyner Library Undergraduate/Graduate Students, 10:00-11:00A

Sarah Stokes   Thomas Mann
Erika Nicholson   Dominique Rowe

East Campus Faculty Sessions, 11:00-12:00P

Gail Munde   Wade G. Dudley   Tom Shields
Elizabeth B. Carroll   Sharon Pruitt

Dean's Council, 12:00-1:00P

Ann Stocks   C. William Gee   Patricia Dragon
Dawn Wainwright   David Hursh   Lisa Barricella
Pam Evans   Linda Teel   Ginny Boyer
Dale Sauter   Angela Whitehurst   David Durant

b. List of students who provided information for the review report (if applicable)

Joyner Library Undergraduate/Graduate Students, 10:00-11:00A, Tuesday, May 14

Sarah Stokes (grad)   Thomas Mann (under)
Erika Nicholson (under)   Dominique Rowe (under)

c. Other relevant information