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Topic 1: Welcome & Who We Are: Carolyn Henderson Allen.
The group agreed to change the name to the Council of University of Arkansas College & Research Libraries (CUACRL). They also agreed to change the mission statement to read: "The mission of the Council of University of Arkansas College & Research Libraries (CUACRL) is to share, maintain, promote—and thereby expand—library resources and services offered to the students and faculty of the U of A institutions in order to advance learning, teaching, research, service, and creativity in the state."

The group reviewed demographic information submitted by each library. The student number is head count not FTE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Librarians</th>
<th>Pro staff</th>
<th>Support staff</th>
<th>Other staff</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Collection budget</th>
<th>Staffing budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowen School of Law</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3 IT</td>
<td>$1,527,561</td>
<td>$483,657</td>
<td>$809,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of A School of Law</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>40 full time; 47 adjunct</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$2,120,949</td>
<td>$903,510</td>
<td>$1,161,439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Morrilton</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$325,411</td>
<td>$60,500</td>
<td>$237,586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Hope</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Batesville</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$176,430</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$84,822</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Phillips</td>
<td>2,199</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>$113,550</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$270,645</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC Cossatot</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>$27,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>$172,721</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
<td>Ratio</td>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>Part-time Funding</td>
<td>96 Part-time Funding</td>
<td>65+7 GAs Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAPB</td>
<td>2,615</td>
<td>161; 38</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$1,292,592</td>
<td>$379,065</td>
<td>$913,499</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Mont</td>
<td>3,643</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$955,855</td>
<td>$298,616</td>
<td>$526,858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAMS</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$2,212,705</td>
<td>$1,940,375</td>
<td>$1,683,249</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UALR</td>
<td>11,891</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>$1,490,489</td>
<td>$2,136,982</td>
<td>$955,855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAFS</td>
<td>7,154</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5 work study</td>
<td>$969,848</td>
<td>$416,166</td>
<td>$481,782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAF</td>
<td>26,754</td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>96 part time</td>
<td>$15,205,168</td>
<td>$6,864,015</td>
<td>$5,768,379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students to Librarians Ratio**

- CC Morrilton: 2,140
- CC Cossatot: 1,542
- CC Batesville: 1,445
- UA Mont: 1,099
- UAF: 910
- Bowen School of Law: 62
- U of A School of Law: 53
**Faculty to Librarians Ratio**

- **UAMS**: 119
- **CC Cossatot**: 86
- **CC Morrilton**: 76
- **UA Mont**: 53
- **CC Batesville**: 43
- **UAF**: 34
- **CC Phillips**: 34
- **UAPB**: 26
- **UALR**: 17
- **U of A School of Law**: 12
- **Bowen School of Law**: 5

**Students to Total Library Personnel Ratio**

- **UAFS**: 715
- **UA Mont**: 455
- **CC Morrilton**: 389
- **CC Phillips**: 366
- **UALR**: 330
- **UAF**: 214
- **UAMS**: 146
- **CC Cossatot**: 140
- **CC Batesville**: 131
- **UAPB**: 111
- **Bowen School of Law**: 26
- **U of A School of Law**: 22
NOTE: Both Cossatot and Phillips Community College have three locations that must be staffed; Phillips at two campuses and Cossatot at three campuses. Staffing is a challenge, particularly with a lack of full time personnel.

Cossatot also manages the tutoring program (ERC) and the textbook program (there is no bookstore). Monticello supports e-Versity. UAMS supports Health Science professionals throughout the state, including regional programs and approximately 10,000 nurses. UA Fort Smith recently had its federal work study program funds cut, but expanded its hours until midnight, and is having difficulty covering scheduled hours adequately. With 715 students for every library employee, UAFS is the most understaffed library in the system in the student to library personnel ration, by a large margin.

Some common themes are inadequate staff numbers to cover hours / locations, inadequate budgets, and aging or unsuitable facilities. Upkeep or maintenance of library facilities comes out of library budgets instead of campus funds.

Topic 2: Open Access Initiatives (Institutional Repositories, Open Educational Resources, and Open Data)

UA Fayetteville recently subscribed to bepress and is in the process of building an institutional repository called ScholarWorks@UARK. The map on the opening page shows the papers downloaded in the past day; the majority of papers loaded so far are theses, dissertations, and honors theses.

The University of Arkansas, Fayetteville Law School is also an early contributor to the institutional repository and their collection is growing. Law schools in general have been early proponents of open access and institutional repositories, in part because law reviews are not profit-driven, so their publishing model historically has not mirrored other academic publishing. There are currently about 120 law schools on bepress, including almost all of the law reviews, in open access format. The UA bepress site allows faculty to post those items they wish to represent their scholarship, which can be seen in the Selected Works section, in which many Law School faculty are represented.
Another major initiative is the Open Educational Resources movement, of which eVersity is an advocate. UA, Fayetteville recently formed a committee of faculty from various disciplines across campus, library personnel, course designers, and bookstore personnel. The goal is to promote open education resources on campus, and the committee is currently recruiting high profile, respected faculty to review open educational resources. The Dean of Distance Education has matched funds with the Libraries to underwrite development of OER resources on campus.

Open Educational Resources can also supplement materials that libraries are required to purchase and provide alternative resources for students.

Relinda Ruth of Cossatot Community College manages the textbook program for the college, which last fall started an OER program and are now at 35% OER. The college offered incentives to faculty to develop OER. There are many credible sources; one just needs to know where to look for them. Many schools are participating in sharing programs. She recommended that every college should consider OER for students, because of the tremendous cost savings to students.

A successful OER program begins with educating faculty, who must review materials to see what is available. The UA bookstore has a software program listing available resources for textbook adoption, and that list now includes OER materials. Most faculty create textbooks that do not profit them; the publishers take the lion's share of proceeds. Creating resources that are open access and can be freely shared for educational purposes raises the profile of the University of Arkansas system. A big question faculty have is the tenure and promotion consideration. If we could get a general statement or policy advocating open access materials in the tenure / promotion portfolio, we would probably win the support of many more faculty in the creation of open access course materials.

Basic education on OER should include Creative Commons licensing and best practices.

Open data is another area for concern. Librarians have become publishers of data by default, because other entities on campus, such as Information Technology Services, have not taken up the issue. UA, Fayetteville has recently convened a committee to construct a data management plan for the campus, which would include establishing protocols, pricing (who pays for it), and servicing. Ohio State hired a firm to manage all data output in the state, Data Management Planning Tool, which is one option. Another possibly less expensive option is get money to manage the data ourselves. The goal of the committee is to have a proposal of what would be the best way to proceed within the next six months.

Nadia Lalla of UAMS noted that her institution has data needs that are complicated with privacy issues, such as patient data. There is no-one-size-fits-all solution to data management needs in the state; however, careful planning of a system with enough flexibility to support 80% to 90% of the data needs in the state would be critical to the well being of the system as a whole.

**Topic 2 Action Item 1**: Develop a program to educate and train faculty on each campus to utilize open educational resources (OER) in their courses.

**Topic 2 Action Item 2**: Investigate opportunities to collaborate on open access initiatives.

**Topic 2 Action Item 3**: Develop a data management plan.

**Topic 3**: SWOT Analyses

University of Arkansas School of Law (UAF)—Randy Thompson
Strengths:
- Solid collection of Arkansas legal materials
- Collection sufficient through ownership or access to fully support faculty research needs
- Physical facility in high student demand as place of study

Weaknesses:
- Infrastructure in need of updating
- Additional student group study and collaboration space is needed
- Improvements in staff skills have not kept pace with rate of technological change in law libraries
- Funding has been flat for past eight years

Opportunities:
- Newer law faculty are increasing the amount and scope of their research activities
- New law school accreditation standards are putting greater emphasis on legal research skills
- Legal employers continue to stress need for improved practice skills from new law graduates
- Future turnover in personnel will open positions for more technologically-savvy staff recruitment

Threats:
- Continuing prospects of flat budgeting
- Potential for continued flat or declining law student enrollment
- Continued need to switch to electronic delivery of materials while maintaining print resources

Notes:
UA Law Library needs more study space in house. Students can use space in Mullins Library, particularly the Grad Student study space. Staff are keeping pace with changing skill sets due to changes in accreditation standards. Librarians teach legal research skills classes.

William H. Bowen School of Law (UALR)--Jessie Burchfield

Strengths:
- Experienced, knowledgeable librarians and staff
- Support of law school dean
- We are also the Pulaski County Law Library and receive some funding for materials from the county

Weaknesses:
- Static budget
- Smaller staff with more responsibilities
- As a public law library, we are experiencing increasing demand for reference help from self-represented litigants. This puts a strain on the staff.

Opportunities:
- Potential partnership with Central Arkansas Legal Services to host a "lawyer in the library" program to address demands of SRLs

Threats:
- Many constituents don't seem to value the library.
- Decreased funding for higher education in general

Notes:
The library at the William H. Bowen School of Law has a new director, who was promoted from the ranks, and her old position has not been re-filled. They have a smaller staff with large responsibilities, including teaching the upper level research skills class. Understaffing affects morale. Almost all of the research questions librarians answer come from the general public, not students. Staff are currently training law students to answer public questions on the reference desk. The "lawyer in the library" program would be pro bono service hours, but would provide another level of assistance to the community questions. Faculty and students continue to misunderstand the librarians' role in curating resources for their research.
Cossatot Community College of the University of Arkansas--Relinda Ruth

**Strengths:**
- The most obvious strength of the ERC is the Circulation assistants. Friendly staff is always available to students and willing to help with any questions.
- Free tutoring is one of the ERC strengths. The director and tutors also offer many free interactive workshops throughout each semester, which have appealed to students.
- The textbook program has also proven to be a viable component to the ERC.

**Weaknesses:**
- Limited funding, which results in less training. Of the ERC staff, only the director works full-time. 8 of 10 are part-time and 2 are Federal Work Study students. Although the staff is knowledgeable in many aspects, the funds to provide better training are unavailable.
- We operate facilities on three separate campuses, which also poses problems with staffing and travel arrangements.
- Lack of funds available to acquire more resources. We currently maintain approximately 57 databases, much of those through Arkansas Traveler. Resources for our medical programs are limited.

**Opportunities:**
- As a member of the UA system, we hope that we will one day have an opportunity to share databases throughout the system.
- We also hope to increase the budget enough to address all the aforementioned concerns

**Threats:**
- Lack of funding available for adequate technology, including media and database access
- Lack of funding available for necessary staff training
- Lack of funding available for more suitable furnishing

**Notes:**
Although all of their staff is part time, they are committed, responsible personnel who conduct workshops once a week on each campus, provide free tutoring, and manage the textbook program. They charge a flat fee of $30 rental fee per textbook (with a replacement or damage fee). The now closed bookstore space is used to store the textbooks. They have no barcode system due to a lack of funding, but that would speed up the rental and return process exponentially. Right now Relinda records the numbers manually in spreadsheets. She maintains three separate budgets, for the library, the tutoring center, and the textbook program. It is very difficult to award any time off to employees for training. They need more online databases; and Relinda looks to the UA system for shared resources.

Phillips Community College of the University of Arkansas--Jerrie Townsend

**Strengths:**
- Low personnel turnover
- Sharing of resources between campuses

**Weaknesses:**
- Largest campus library in a building not designed for a library; not well-suited to the expansion needed to accommodate technological changes.
- Two smaller campuses have no expansion room to add additional computer workstations, study rooms, etc.
- Funding continues to decline each year

**Opportunities:**
- We need IT support specifically assigned to assist the library. They need training regarding library databases and operational software.
- We would like to have more input from faculty regarding library acquisitions

**Threats:**
- Continuing decline in funding

**Notes:**
Library staff are long-term employees who are well known to students. A courier runs between the three library locations daily. The current facility is not handicapped accessible; due to its age, it was grandfathered in. Phillips is the oldest two-year college in the state. State funding has been flat. The Helena / West Helena population has been steadily declining and the area is currently in an economic depression, which results in a decrease of student enrollment, which in turn results in budget cuts to the library.

University of Arkansas Community College at Batesville--Jay Strickland

Strengths:
- Facilities are in good shape since building is fairly new.
- Administration is dedicated to making the library an integral part of campus. The Vice Chancellor has told me his vision is to see the library full of students.
- The library staff is dedicated to helping students with their information needs.
- The Library is open seven days a week assist students.

Weaknesses:
- Weaknesses of the library structure, including infrastructure, staffing, funding, etc.: Although the staff is dedicated, we are understaffed. It is often hard to work around when someone is absent. Currently, there are two days a week when the Library Director is the only person on duty for about two hours. I am hoping to shortly have at least a work study to help out in this situation.
- One of the weaknesses is, truthfully, me (Library Director). This is my first position as Library Director and also my first position in library management. There is much I do not know and much that I am still learning.

Opportunities:
- The Library just started Sunday hours during the fall semester. We partnered with the Student Success Center on campus to provide tutors during the Sunday hours. This has greatly increased the visibility of the Library among the students and we are seeing greater numbers in the Library.
- My wish is to hire more staff, especially who have library degrees. We have one part-time worker who is currently working on his MLS, but I don’t think I can get him to stay after he graduates unless I can open up a full-time position for him.

Threats:
- none

Notes:
The library is understaffed and lack experience. This past fall the library expanded its hours to include Sunday, due to the high number of students without internet access in the area due to a lack of infrastructure, and in response to a request from the Vice Chancellor to accommodate student needs. The library has campus partners to provide tutoring on site. To encourage the use of facilities on the weekend, the library sometimes has free food events on site.

University of Arkansas Community College at Morrilton--Rebecka Virdan

Strengths:
- Support of current administration
- Amount of electronic content considering size of college
- Modern, attractive building
- Convenience of combining library and tutoring services
- Support of the student population.

Weaknesses:
- Design of building does not support flexible space – it is difficult to add additional computers or rearrange spaces
- Few library technicians and few work study hours
- Difficulty getting buy in from computer services department for library projects
Opportunities:
- Increase in online-only and hybrid classes – opportunities for library to serve students digitally

Threats:
- Decrease in funding due to low enrollment
- Not hiring full time staff following employee retirements

Notes:
Primarily the library relies upon the Traveler project from the State Library for access to resources. The facility was opened in 2009, so it has lots of natural lighting, but the infrastructure did not support data expansion. Recently they upgraded to 36 laptop computers and 30 laptops purchased with grant funds, but additional computers will require extensive renovations, including drilling through concrete slabs. The college will be combining academic services with the library. Staff use LibGuides for research guides to instruct students. A decrease in the student population resulted in staff layoffs. Morrilton CC provides information literacy for 600 entering students per year.

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville—Carolyn Allen

Strengths:
- Extensive manuscript collections in Arkansas history, politics, and journalism
- Growing collections in Middle Eastern Studies, Native American Studies, streaming audio & video, historical and African American newspapers
- Nano-science, biomedical engineering, and nursing collections
- Membership in consortia such as GWLA, CRL, CNI, CLIR, SPARC, ICPSR

Weaknesses:
- No current collection fully supports the 39 doctoral programs offered at the University
- Ability to grow collections limited by serials price escalation of 6%-8% annually
- Underfunded budget (our 2014 total expenditures: $13,775,696; SEC average: $21,381,562; peer university average: $21,058,688; top 10 public university average: $34,951,106)
- Collection deterioration due to lack of significant funding for preservation /conservation program
- Subject liaison and collection development duties spread across too few librarians
- Lagging behind peer institutions in supporting preservation and promotion of campus research
- Too few personnel to support major initiatives and programs
- Aging buildings and facilities unequipped to meet 21st Century student needs.

Opportunities:
- Science Library: $26 million
- Mullins Library renovation: $85 million for full, $20 million for phased minimalist project
- ARTS Library: $30 million (American Radio & Television Script Library; valued at $71.4 million in 2013)

Threats:
- Recent and upcoming retirements represent significant loss of institutional memory
- Capital output needed to keep pace with rapidly changing technologies

Notes:
The Libraries at Fayetteville collaborate with other institutions in the state in support of nursing programs. They are aware of their obligation to take a leadership role in solving problems in librarianship for the benefit of other libraries in the state. Membership in consortia conveys benefits and cost savings that often offset membership fees; worth investigating. The serials price escalation has been 6-8% annual for decades now. Recently the Resource Sharing Committee negotiated a contract with Elsevier for a 4% price increase for the next five years through collective bargaining for Science Direct. There may be similar opportunities that will decrease individual costs to subscriptions that we should aggressively pursue. The Libraries are engaged in a transition from paper based to electronic materials. We are constructing an offsite storage facility that will house 3/4 of the collection, which will be retrieved on
request from patrons. The facility will house 1.7 volumes, microforms, artifacts including art work, and Special Collections materials. The University conducted a study of the main library facility, Mullins Library, and concluding that a full renovation of Mullins Library would cost $85 million. So we are planning for a partial renovation, which will include moving out the materials to create more study spaces for students and collective student spaces.

University of Arkansas at Fort Smith—Bob Frizzell

Strengths:
- Electronic offerings to users
- Local history collection
- Full-time archivist in building (but not supervised by library)

Weaknesses:
- Small hardcopy collection
- Legacy as community college
- No increasing in staffing when building was expanded and hours were lengthened
- Inadequate student worker budget

Opportunities:
- Greater visibility on campus, more participation by the library in campus events,
- Obtaining a materials offering commensurate with the curriculum,
- Freeing librarians and support staff with more student workers,
- Starting an institutional repository,
- Re-gaining laptops to circulate in the building to users
- More frequent re-training of staff

Threats:
- Continued decline in materials purchasing power
- New administrative requirements unaccompanied by resources required to meet such demands
- General budgetary threats to entire campus including enrollment decline, reduction of legislative support and loss of local tax support

Notes:
The library created a 24-hour study zone with seating for 30 people, but it is not large enough to accommodate demand. They house 200 computers for student use. They have 64,000 volumes for 7,000 students. There has been recent administrative turnover. The library is confined by University restrictions on webpage, which is a conflict between the information-driven pages of other units on campus with the construction of a web page for the library to be used as a tool for research. The library has been cutting databases due to materials budget cuts. A tax in Fort Smith that benefits the library may not be renewed when it comes up on the ballot. There is a library fee on campus, but the fee does not go to the library. Instead it goes to a general appropriation fund. The library is starting to use funds from its endowment for databases and operating expenses.

University of Arkansas at Little Rock—J. B. Hill

Strengths:
- Knowledgeable/Approachable faculty/staff with diverse personalities and skills
- Diverse Collections, available in library and via remote access
- Outside recognition of services and collections
- Location on campus
- External partnerships (e.g. ArkReach and ASI with CALS)
- Customer Service
- Organizational restructuring
- Reserves - textbooks, laptops, ipads
• Extended hours
• Plan for the learning commons.
• New Furniture/Art

**Weaknesses:**
• Lagging technology
• Budget – all areas
• Lack of promotion/Misconception of what we do among students and faculty
• Internal Communication/ need for crossing training
• Old Facilities – Furniture/Temperature/Electricity
• Lack of staffing and need to increase staff skills
• Need for analysis of existing data and to make case for library value
• Need to enhance online and social media presence

**Opportunities:**
• Community collaborations/outreach and partnerships within division and on campus. (E-Stem, UALR Online, CALS)
• Upcoming renovations and learning commons
• Build a new/better brand; actively market services and collections
• New people – fresh ideas
• Provost’s support
• Student involvement – service learning, student employees, student advisory group
• Training for staff and student workers. Cross training as a result of restructuring
• Faculty involvement. New faculty on campus
• Grants can help funding and engagement with other departments
• New Technology

**Threats:**
• Budget - uncertainty of level of university and state funding:
  o Arkansas legislature and government – funding for UALR, C&A
  o Campus/library budget cuts – material costs increasing, doing more with less
  o Changes in campus fee structure due to online pricing
• Campus perception of library & collections
  o Perception that everything is free
  o With move to e-resources, print collection appears dated
• Potential to fall behind in technology and furniture
• Disintermediation and new librarian roles
• Technology overload – need for training, time and software
• Changes in campus administration

**Notes:**
The library is exploring partnerships for community engagement, including the public library system. ArkReach is a resource sharing partnership between the University of Arkansas at Little Rock (UALR) and the Central Arkansas Library System (CALS). ArkReach enables library users at both institutions to directly request and borrow materials from either of the two library systems. With ArkReach, UALR students, faculty and staff are able to search a catalog of shared holdings, identify books, DVDs and CDs at a CALS public library branch, and request that the materials be delivered to the UALR Ottenheimer Library. The library is currently marketing / branding databases so that student understand what is provided by the library. UALR has 19 online degree programs, which is a competition with eVersity. The fee structure is different for online students. The chancellor announced his retirement.

**University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences--Nadia Lalla**

**Strengths:**
• Focused on all aspects of health sciences (education, research, and clinical care)
• Intended audience: Arkansas healthcare workforce, UAMS students, limited supportive resource for patients
• Historical Research Center responsible for collecting and preserving history of medicine in the state of Arkansas or regarding Arkansans
• Serves as National Network Library of Medicine Resource Library (only one in state)
• Supports UAMS Regional Programs in the state (library and outreach services)

**Weaknesses:**
• Funding: Recent library budgets have been unable to keep pace with inflationary costs
• Staffing: Aging workforce with limited development opportunities for paraprofessionals
• Staffing: Challenged to create and fund new professional positions, e.g., data services librarian
• Infrastructure: Insufficient support of library services and resources to UAMS Northwest branch
• Infrastructure: Current library organizational structure doesn’t match environment
• Infrastructure: Lack of institutional repository

**Opportunities:**
• Library managing campus online bookstore effective April 2016
• Shared funding for resources via expanded partnerships with UAMS Regional Programs, UAMS Division of Research
• Access to fund raising and directed giving through joint activities with UAMS Institutional Advancement
• Shared funding for programs and research via tentative partnership with Arkansas History Commission, Butler Center for Arkansas Studies (Central Arkansas Library System), Center for Arkansas History and Culture (UALR)
• Enhanced national visibility of the Historical Research Center

**Threats:**
• Future funding: Priority at UAMS on clinical enterprise, then research, then education (colleges), then academic support (library)
• Potential new academic health sciences libraries at New York Institute of Technology’s College of Osteopathic Medicine (Jonesboro) and Arkansas College of Osteopathic Medicine (Fort Smith)
• Loss of storage space in on-site facility and associated transportation and storage costs with use of off-site facility
• Institutional reallocation of dedicated library space
• Alignment of revenue-generating bookstore with library and accompanying divergent values, e.g., sale of textbooks (bookstore) vs open education initiatives (library)
• Uncertain institutional support for the development of librarian and paraprofessional staff and skills
• Exclusion from campus discussions and decision-making on data repositories and computing needs
• Lack of institutional understanding of computing needs required to support library resources and services (including records management)
• Multiple institutional information system silos which do not communicate with stakeholders such as the library
• Decentralized institutional bureaucracy for decision-making and accountability
• Institutional renewal, negotiation, or cancellation of licenses which affect access to resources without consulting the Library, e.g., performance royalties, bundled vendor offerings

**Notes:**
The Historical Data Research Center is scheduled to open on May 9. It will raise the prominence of UAMS to a national level. It was funded by grants and by donors. The pace of change on the UAMS campus is phenomenal. The price escalation of serials in the medical field range from 8% to 23% annually. The campus is deploying third year students to regional areas. The resources are aging, and staff are creating succession planning. Campus is planning for an institutional repository and data preservation program, but the library has been left out of the conversations. Campus recently moved to a virtual...
bookstore, which includes an online marketplace for students to sell to students. It also includes UAMS licensed merchandise and lab equipment. Students can pay for their textbooks online with financial aid funds. 60% of the funding comes from the clinical areas.

University of Arkansas at Monticello—Dan Boice

Strengths:
- Central location on campus
- Reputation for friendly service, strong student support
- Close to coffee shop
- Good support from I.T., other campus services.
- Professional staff is generally good, innovative.
- Good support from the teaching faculty

Weaknesses:
- Poor print collection: traditionally low book budget combined with no weeding results in a small but surprisingly useless collection.
- Low salaries; recruiting professionals is problematic; holding onto good staff is also difficult.
- Library building needs significant internal remodeling.
- University support for I.T. has been minimal; our machines are old, wheezing

Opportunities:
- New chancellor, indicates strong support for our initiatives
- Academic deans and others are excited about our goals, like moving Student Services into the library, which is generating goodwill.
- Hoping to leverage eVersity connection into more bucks for online resources.

Threats:
- University funding is never secure, especially with penalties for poor retention.
- Facility: poorly constructed roof always threatens leaks after a strong rain.

Notes:
The chancellor asked what to do to make the library more essential to student success. The student base is declining. UA Monticello is an open enrollment school, and are working on improving retention. For instance, they determined that students succeed more in 8-week courses than in 16-week courses. Student Services (writing center) is moving into the library.

University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff—Georgette Wiley

Strengths:
- The support of Dr. Laurence B. Alexander, Chancellor and Dr. Jacquelyn McCray, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
- Library and UAPB Staff Development
- Library Collaborative Maker Spaces
- Library Liaison Program
- Information Literacy Program.

Weaknesses:
- Exterior structural issues related to the main library. However, these issues have been analyzed and are currently being addressed.

Opportunities:
- The ongoing vision of the John Brown Watson Memorial Library System, in keeping with the mission of the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, comes to fruition annually. Furthermore, the vision is evaluated, based on data-driven statistics, and updated to ensure best practices for UAPB faculty and students.

Threats:
Notes:
UAPB has a new and energetic chancellor. Historically Black Colleges and Universities Program (HBCU) title 3 funding has been helpful to the library. Library staff are encouraged to attend library school. There are no funds available to expand the library; the only option is to repurpose space within the existing library. During a recent accreditation review, librarians served on every criterion. The library goals are data-driven. They survey students and faculty and then proceed with their recommendations. The library houses collaborative maker spaces.

Topic 4: Dr. Michael Moore, Vice President, UA System

The UA system is changing, as evident through the implementation of eVersity, which uses open educational resources and open data. The system currently contains academic institutions, including the two- and four-year institutions represented at this meeting, the Hot Springs High School, and the Clinton School of Public Service, and non-academic side including the Division of Agriculture, which maintains a presence in each county in the state through the county extension service, the Criminal Justice Institute, the Winthrop Rockefeller Institute, and the Archeological Survey.

The UA system has long operated as a loose association of independent actors with diverse missions, based on the organic growth of each institution. The system-wide rules apply to all. The system has pooled resources in health care and legal. There is no system-wide brand or marketing.

Higher education is fundamentally changing. State resources will not be coming back. We are forced to look for new ways of doing business. There are too many schools in the higher education system; some will go out of business across the nation. Demographics show tuition-paying students declining for the next six years, at a minimum. We are close to pricing people out of an education. The middle class has been squeezed; we face a student loan crisis. We owe more nationwide in student loan debt than we do in credit card debt.

We need to develop different models of education that will be sustainable into the future. We can forget about getting any more money from the legislature. Instead, we need to work on increasing efficiencies and finding alternative sources of funding.

One area of possible cost savings is the practice of negotiating system-wide contracts with vendors. Recently the system negotiated the renewal of the Blackboard contract, which was previously negotiated in nine different contracts, all with varied and inconsistent pricing. By negotiating system-wide, not only did the system save on the total cost, but also opened up access to Blackboard to some of the smaller institutions that did not have it.

Eversity is a different model, an outsourced model independent of state funding and based on tuition. It represents a different way of looking at the problem. Ideally, each course development would pair a faculty member, a librarian, and the course designer. Any materials designed for OER on the eVersity system can be freely shared on all other campuses.

The system has no money to purchase for individual campuses, but the system can advocate on behalf of individual budgets. We are looking for efficiency, and in doing so, may have to take independent choice off the table. We are only going to get funds to do other things or keep doing them by cooperating on collective purchasing. We must first take stock of what resources we need collectively, then negotiate those common contracts for the group.

Topic 5: IT Services
Ideally, we would see some consistency in the web page design or available library information from institution to institution. There are pros and cons to working closely with IT Services to construct library pages. But it would be beneficial to develop a standard or a similar frame for each of the library websites, or at least their home pages. The library website has to work as a tool; most other institutional pages are information-driven designs. For instance, on some library webpages, it is difficult to find contact information for the staff, or hours the library is open, or how to conduct basic research.

Some libraries in the system have very limited control over the design and functionality of their webpages. Also each page must be ADA compliant.

It would also be helpful to have each library listed with the academic units on the institution's main website, because finding the library from the main page is difficult on some websites. The library should be easily found on the institution's homepage; each library website should include an "about" page with consistent information.

Other IT issues include poor communication about upgrades and changes. One suggestion is to assign a library liaison with the IT services who can report back any proposed changes, so that staff can plan for disruptions in service or broken functionality.

We also do not need to duplicate efforts--if IT Services has the staff to solve a design or software problem, then use them rather than assigning library staff to the problem.

Another issue is library requests for IT Services being put on the back burner.

It all boils down to having a functional and usable website for each library.

**Topic 5 Action Item 1:** Outline standardized best practices for minimum information that should appear on each library's home page.

**Topic 5 Action Item 2:** Ask the system to endorse those minimum standards, and advocate with IT Services on our behalf to meet those standards.

**Topic 6: Cooperative Services**

In many consortia, database and materials savings are greater than the membership fees. Materials provided through membership are good for accreditors and good for distance education students.

All of the CUACRL libraries are members of AMIGOS except UA Law, who pays for training on a as need basis rather than paying for membership. AMIGOS is one of the largest library service networks in the nation and provides continuing education, vendor discounts, and professional advice to members.

ARKLink is a nonprofit organization of 52 college and university libraries cooperating to deliver services and collections to researchers in Arkansas. They offer consortial purchasing of resources, a statewide reciprocal borrowing program using the ARKLink Card, allowing students to borrow books from other participating members, and a courier service delivering materials to member libraries quickly and inexpensively.

ArkLink has a non-enforceable charter. How does it coordinate with the State Library? How are priorities set?

The ArkLink card is frequently utilized by students at Morrilton Community College, who use larger academic libraries adjacent to their homes, such as UALR or Arkansas Tech.

What other consortia do we need to investigate? Could we negotiate as a group through AMIGOS?
As we investigate cooperative opportunities for shared resources, it is important to keep in mind that health sciences databases are calculated differently, some on hospital beds rather than FTE, for instance.

Occam's Reader is an interlibrary loan software developed and hosted by Texas Tech that allows participating institutions to share electronic books from Springer. The cost is $500 per library per year.

**Topic 6 Action Item 1:** Charge the Resource Sharing Committee to compile a list of the databases we currently purchase from the Traveler project and the ArkLink databases. Determine what database needs are not currently being met by each library. Identify joint needs, duplication, wish lists, including Ebsco databases lost through the Traveler project migration to ProQuest.

**Topic 6 Action Item 2:** Charge the Resource Sharing Committee with exploring opportunities for collective bargaining for the databases on behalf of all system libraries.

**Topic 6 Action Item 3:** Charge the Resource Sharing Committee to investigate other consortia that might provide cost savings on collections and services, such as LYRASIS (formerly SOLINET).

**Topic 7: CUACRL Committees**

**Resource Sharing Committee**

Recently the Resource Sharing Committee negotiated a contract with Elsevier for a 4% price increase for the next five years through collective bargaining for Science Direct.

**Digital Initiatives Committee**

The Digital Initiatives Committee submitted a report. After conducting a survey in early March, the committee identified seven target activities, which were prioritized according to survey responses.

**Results from survey**

1. Develop a shared preservation plan for unique materials (12)
2. Develop common standards of metadata (19)
3. Implement a scanning program, with materials to be scanned in support of faculty programs. (32)
4. Identify unique materials from each UA campus to be digitized (34)
5. Explore the possibilities for system-wide access to data repositories, providing search capabilities across collections (39)
6. Expand digital access to include other state institutions (44)
7. Explore the prospect of a statewide institutional repository (44) *(UA system-wide IR)*

**Proposed plan**

The target activities are divided into calendar quarters.

1st Quarter (January - March) - This is the time we have spent with introductions, assessing current environment, and planning.
2nd Quarter (April - June) - Plan for priorities 1 and 2 as stated above.
3rd Quarter (July - September) - Plan for priorities 3 and 4 as stated above.
4th Quarter (October - November) - Conduct research to advise on the potential execution of priorities 5, 6, and 7, also, stated above.

**Suggested methodology**
There are two strategies for addressing the workload. First, the committee could work as one team, and implement priorities 1 and 2 beginning in April. However, this would require more than one quarterly meeting as the work is divided into 4 or 6 weeks segments. Second, the committee could divide the number of members into two teams, and each team will select one priority (divide and conquer strategy). The disadvantage of this idea is that not everyone gets to work on all of the activities.

Education Portal Committee
The Education Portal Committee submitted a report and made the following requests:

1. That we NOT maintain the portal in its current form, since it is too difficult to keep updated. It is too labor-intensive for a single campus, and does not permit collaborative effort.
2. That we move to a platform that does permit collaboration and can easily be linked and managed through each institution’s website. Members will be looking into alternatives that allow all of us to participate with our unique resources (Elizabeth McKee suggested building a LibGuide).
3. That we work toward a statewide consortium, and possibly a website, perhaps in cooperation with other CUARL committees or ARKLink. Since our focus is on Arkansas materials, this would be more efficient in bringing them all together. A single portal would also simplify options for the K-12 teaching community.

All of the requests were approved by the CUACRL.

Human Resources
Directors at community colleges are sometimes faculty, sometimes not. Librarians need to be on the campus faculty committees to provide feedback on academic issues and prepare for changes that are discussed before they are implemented. Problem solving is much more efficient when we know the issues in advance; allowing the libraries to be proactive rather than reactive to faculty initiatives.

Librarians at UAPB recently gained faculty status, after a long, persistent struggle.

Higher education libraries have little comparison with public and state libraries, but the state standards are all based on public library roles. A consistent classification system will help us demand equitable wages system wide. Often work is described at the lowest possible level to cheat workers out of equitable wages. The CUACRL libraries should be the model and the catalyst for the state in establishing standards for providing fair wages for work performed.

The idea here is not to price the state out of the market, but to request a general phase in, with the community college inequities dealt with first, then moving on to the four-year colleges, to make the initial impact on the budget less.

**Topic 7 Action Item 1**: Charge HR Committee with providing information or training on succession plans.

**Topic 7 Action Item 2**: Charge HR Committee with defining what type of training is needed, from Microsoft Office and office productivity tools, to training in soft skills, like improving leadership skills or interpersonal relations.

**Topic 7 Action Item 3**: Charge HR Committee with providing training opportunities to increase technical skills common in libraries.

**Topic 7 Action Item 4**: Charge HR Committee with exploring the feasibility of establishing a CUARL staff fund for training, travel, membership, or service in national organizations.
**Topic 7 Action Item 5:** Charge the HR Committee with reviewing the state classification system and recommending standards for higher education libraries.
- Collect comparative data
- Reference national standards, including the Stanford model
- Compare wage rates and work levels to ARL standards and data
- Standardize a classification system for levels of work and responsibilities being undertaken at all libraries.

**Topic 7 Action Item 6:** Charge the HR Committee with providing an overview of how position lines are assigned and how budgets are allocated for specific positions.

**Topic 7 Action Item 7:** Present data and information collected to the UA System, and ask them to advocate for change at the state Department of Education.

**Topic 7 Action Item 8:** Use this information from the national market to make an appeal to the state legislature.

**Topic 8: Budget**
We have had no increase in the maintainence budget for eight years from the state legislature. We need to demonstrate the impact of the services we provide as measured by the dollars spent.

ARL provides [Spec Kits](#) (specification kits). SPEC surveys gather information from ARL member institutions on current research library practices and policies. These guides help libraries learn about current practice in research libraries, implement new practices and technologies, manage change, and improve performance. Some of them contain information on salaries measures—collection size, FTEs, budget expenditures. ARL Spec Kits are a good source of data you can use to make your case with your administration. They cover trends and programs being developed across the US and Canada, so you can get ideas of new programs and services to implement in your library. This will broaden your scope and give a different perspective. Peripheral materials add quality to the value of an education.

**Topic 8 Action Item 1:** Hold a workshop on how to put together a budget proposal in the next CUACRL meeting, including how to articulate the need, even when you don't get funding.

**Topic 8 Action Item 2:** Explore strategies to work together as a team to improve budgets.

**Topic 8 Action Item 3:** Review various softwares used to create and maintain budgets.

**Topic 8 Action Item 4:** Host workshop on finding and applying for grants, including service to the disadvantaged awards, and creating or building library endowments.

**Topic 8 Action Item 5:** Conduct a workshop on fundraising strategies at a future CUACRL meeting.

**Topic 8 Action Item 6:** Draw up a proposal to fund subscriptions to Spec Kits for every library in the system, in order to bring library directors up to date on trend in libraries. Purchase back issues from 2015 forward and an annual ongoing subscription.

**Topic 9: Collections**
The biggest challenge in collection management is keeping pace with serial increases. There are no independent parts of the system. We need to work together to make an impact. CUACRL libraries could be the model for other groups in each institution who are not working collectively to solve common problems. As a group, we need to concentrate on what we can fix. Libraries are often in the background, but could and should be critical to student success both while in college and in their future careers.

Only three of the directors currently have fundraising responsibilities in coordination with the development officer on campus. Each director should investigate opportunities for fundraising, including gift proposals, meeting with donors, making the case for specific needs, etc. All directors should be involved in fundraising and developing strategies and plans to continue a part of what the development office does on an ongoing basis. Develop allies, or people in the community with clout. Prove your case by using data, examples, case studies. Be prepared to discuss strengths and weaknesses, and prove how the gift will impact students and research on your campus. Be specific in outcomes.

Write proposals structured toward individual donor interest, for examples, history or business. Make your case to the development officer or get involved in joint proposals with academic departments.

**Topic 9 Action Item 1**: Explore the possibility of creating a shared endowment for the system libraries to fund resources shared in common among the libraries. If it grows large enough, we could use the endowment to pay for core digital collections and each library use its own budget to pay for needs that are specific to that campus's programs. Make the case to the state legislature for funding core academic collections, modeled on Georgia's program that is controlled by the state university system.