The University Libraries is the collective name applied to the system of the centrally administered, university-supported libraries that serve the information needs of the students, faculty, and staff of the University of Memphis. The Government Publications Department is the Regional Depository for U. S. Federal Documents, serving all citizens of the State of Tennessee. As one of the largest academic libraries in this region of the country, we also fill an important role as a community resource for the residents of southwestern Tennessee, northern Mississippi, and western Arkansas.

I.   Structure
         A. The University Libraries' System
         The University Libraries system is comprised of a main library, four branches, and a branch affiliate. McWherter Library is the main library. It houses the humanities and social science collections and other collections that don't specifically fall into one of the branch collections, technical services offices, the Government Publications Collection, Special Collections, Libraries Systems, and the University Libraries Administrative Office. The branch libraries are located in proximity to the disciplines they support. They include the Music Library located in the Rudy Scheidt School of Music, the Math Library located in Dunn Hall, the Chemistry Library located in Smith Hall, and the Audiology and Speech Language Pathology Library located downtown in the AUSP Building on Jefferson St. The Earth Sciences Library located in the Center for Earthquake Studies has an affiliation with the University Libraries although it is not an official branch of the system. The Law School Library and the Egyptology Library are not a part of the University Libraries system.

         B. Branch Libraries
         The branch libraries were established during the time when discipline specific libraries were very popular on academic campuses. The first branch library was established in 1968. Originally there were five full branch libraries. Supporting these branch libraries has always been difficult and expensive. Folding the collections of the Engineering Branch Library into the McWherter Library reduced the number of branches.   There were then four official branch libraries. When the McWherter Library was being planned in the 1980s, the original plan was to eliminate the branch libraries and consolidate all of the collections into one centralized facility. As the planning dragged on and building costs increased, the original building plan had to be scaled down to fit a dwindling construction budget. The idea of a fully consolidated library faded with the advent of a plan for a smaller, more affordable building. It was clear before the building was completed that the new building would not easily hold all the existing library collections. Additional shelving space could be provided by installing additional shelving but this would decrease the seating available for library users, a problem noted in the previous main

library building. Nor would there be expansion space to plan for adding new programs and/or services or for adding new personnel.

Beyond the simple difficulty of managing multiple locations, there are several problems with the existing branch libraries. One major problem is the fact that the branches were never conceived of as full service libraries. They are neither staffed nor equipped to meet the full library needs of most serious library users. Of the four branch libraries and one semi-branch currently affiliated with the University Libraries only the Music Library functions as a full service library. It has a full time faculty Librarian and two full time staff members plus several student assistants. During the academic year, the hours of the Music Library are: Mon-Thu. 7: 45 am to 10:00 pm, Fri. 7:45 am to 4:30 pm, Saturday 11 am to 3 pm, and Sunday 6 pm to 10 pm. The University Libraries assume full responsibility for the facility and controls access to the library. Access to the collections is limited to the times when libraries' personnel are present. This branch operates under the same policies and procedures that are in effect in the McWherter Library.

The other branch libraries were created by equipping with shelving whatever room happened to be available in the related academic building and calling that room a library. In truth, they function more as reading rooms than as full service libraries. With the exception of the Chemistry Library, which has two staff members, each of the branches is a single person operation. A single staff member, a Library Assistant, in most cases, staffs each branch and is scheduled to work in the branch Monday through Friday from 8 am to 4:30 pm. As funds allow some student assistant hours are usually provided to the branch libraries to help to extend staff coverage. In most instances, these branches are staffed for about 40 hours per week. During other hours, the faculty and staff of the supported department have free access to these branch libraries because they have all been issued keys to the library. In one case, that of the Audiology and Speech Language Pathology library, there is not even a lockable door to the area occupied by the library so it is always open. An 'understood' honor code is expected to ensure that library users comply with library policies when the library staff member is not present.   This open access was set up many years ago to compensate for the low staffing levels in the branches; it was thought to be a good way to provide easy user access to the collections.   It has apparently been a great convenience to the users of the branch libraries in that they have ready access to the library and its resources whenever they wish. While convenient for users, this arrangement has been a nightmare for the libraries. It makes it very difficult for the libraries to manage the branch collections and it creates serious security problems.

Because of poor staffing, it is impossible to provide quality service in these branches. Moreover it is extremely difficult to ensure consistency in the services that are provided. It is even difficult to ensue that the branches will be staffed much less have good quality staff or a faculty member with training

in a relevant discipline. Access to these branches has been an ongoing problem. Although after hours users are specifically instructed not to admit others to the library, it happens frequently.   Users entering the branches after hours do not always make sure the library is locked when they leave. On many occasions, Libraries' staff has arrived in the morning to discover these branch libraries wide open and unoccupied. Although a manual check out system has been provided for those who wish to borrow library materials, those who use the collections after hours do not always check out the materials that they remove from the collections. When items are discovered to be missing from these branch libraries, it is impossible to determine what has become of them. Because the branches cover special disciplines, the books for those collections are typically costlier than the more general interest books that we purchase. It is very expensive to have to replace these items that mysteriously disappear.

Four of the branch libraries are full-fledged branches of the University Libraries' System. They are funded centrally and managed consistently through the University Libraries' administration. The faculty, staff, and student workers are hired and paid by the University Libraries. They are expected to observe the same policies and procedures, as does McWherter Library. The fifth branch library is currently not a full branch of the University Libraries. It was created separate from the University Libraries system, outside of the existing branch library policy, and subsequently became loosely affiliated with the system.

Created as a part of a grant funded project, the Earth Sciences Library began its affiliation with the University Libraries in 1988.   The University Libraries' Geology collection was combined with that of the grant funded Earth Quake Center collection. There was some thought that over time this might become a full branch of the University Libraries system; however, that transition was neither planned for nor implemented. The funding for this branch has remained split between the University Libraries and the department that received the initial grant. When there was a librarian in that branch she worked for and was paid by the department. There was historically little communication between that library and the McWherter Library. The department covers typical operating costs of the branch such as telephone, postage, and similar expenses. The department also purchases some of the materials that end up in the collection.   Books and other resources are purchased by the University Libraries and were, until staffing became an issue, housed in the Earth Sciences Library. Since there is no staff in the branch, the University Libraries no longer sends new library materials to the branch. Most of the materials in the branch have been cataloged and appear in the University Libraries' online catalog.

Since the summer of 1999, the University Libraries has provided computer support and other technical assistance for this quasi branch library.   From

1999 until she left, the Earth Sciences librarian was included in training and other staff development activities of the University Libraries. There were some preliminary discussions about the possibility of making this a full-fledged branch of the University Libraries, however, budgetary concerns have been among the major stumbling blocks barring that transition. The department would like to transfer the responsibility and retain the budget. The libraries cannot afford to absorb the responsibility of the branch unless its operating budget also transfers. Moreover, it needs to be evaluated in keeping with the policy on establishing branch libraries.

In 1974, the University adopted a policy statement, which addresses the establishment of new branch libraries. This policy was a first step in recognizing that there should be administrative review as well as standards for branch libraries. (See Attachment A: *Guidelines for Branch Libraries in Colleges and Universities,* adopted by the Association of College and Research Libraries, June 26, 1990.) It is a beginning but it does not go far enough. It does not guard against the defacto creation of independent branch libraries that are later expected to become a part of the University Libraries system. Nor has this policy been updated to reflect the changing role of the libraries and the real need for adequately supporting branch libraries. For instance, there should be an expectation that each branch library will be staffed at a level that will enable it to be open to library users an established minimum number of hours each week. Each branch library should be equipped with computer support, a security system, and other infrastructure needed to maintain a viable branch library. The University Libraries should control access to all of its library facilities and the expectation for after hours access should be eliminated. All resources in the branch library should be searchable in the online catalog. Materials should routinely be checked out through the online system in the branches just as they are in the McWherter Library. Reasonable security measures need to be maintained in all library facilities for the safety of staff, users, and the collections. Without these minimum standards for library facilities, staffing, and services we cannot begin to guarantee quality library services.

During the budget crisis of 2002, the recommendation was made that three of the branch libraries be eliminated. Folding the collections of those branches into the McWherter Library would have several benefits. It would improve library service to the users of those collections, as they would have access to the expertise of the full faculty and staff of the McWherter Library. It would improve the browse ability of the collections because more of the Libraries' collections would be in integrated into one location. This is particularly important now because of the increase in cross-disciplinary research and study. It would free up space in the buildings of departments that are in need of space for academic programs and faculty. Space now occupied by the branch libraries could be reclaimed by the departments for other uses. It would improve accountability for the collections. Because the collections

would be under the constant supervision of library faculty and staff, there would be a likely decrease in the number of unexplained disappearances of library resources; this would reduce our costs of replacing these items. It would allow the University Libraries to redeploy the three staff currently in those branches to address unfilled needs in other areas of the organization. It would reduce operating costs for the University Libraries in that it would reduce the amount of staff time consumed by servicing those branch libraries. The time and effort now required to move materials among the branch libraries and the McWherter Library would be significantly reduced.

While branch libraries can serve a purpose, in order to do that they must be adequately supported. When personnel, space, and other support are inadequate, the benefits of having a branch library are seriously compromised. Thought must be given to the branch libraries that now exist at the University of Memphis and a decision must be made to either support them so they can be effect branch libraries or fold them into the main library where the collections can be properly supported as a part of the whole.

II.   Facilities
A. McWherter Library opened in 1994. It was a badly needed replacement for a two-part library building that had been in service since 1968 (Wilder Tower) and 1929 (Brister Building). The new building is a great improvement over the old one. It is light and open and users feel safe when studying on the floors. The building offers 195,000 square feet of assignable space. It is unfortunate that the building was built to be a static environment. The public and staff areas were seemingly built with the expectation that the library would always continue to be exactly what it was when the building was planned in the 1980s. It appears that not much thought was given to building-in flexibility. Consequently, reconfiguring the building's space to accommodate changing needs is a major undertaking that will also be costly.

While overall it is a very nice building, a few of the building design elements have proven to be problematic. One of these problem areas is the assignment of space in staff work areas. Library work requires that staff work with large volumes of materials. The typical staff member works with one or more book trucks full of books as well as other resources in order to do his or her job. In addition to needing room for these trucks, staff members need to be able to spread out work to be most effective. Yet the staff work spaces in McWherter were not designed to accommodate the staff and the amounts of material that must be routinely handled. Rather the staff is in small offices or modular cubicles that provide inadequate work space. Reconfiguring the workspaces will be costly and time consuming. It is unclear currently if we actually have enough non-public space to be able to adequately accommodate the staff

but the re-planning of this staff space is critical and it's a project that must be undertaken in the near future. Funds will be needed to do this.

While our beautiful Rotunda provides a very attractive entry to the building and is a good site for events, it also presents a problem. The Rotunda was planned to be lit totally by natural light. That works well on sunny days but if it's cloudy or once the sun goes down, it is quite dark in the rotunda. This is a problem for staff trying to provide service in the area at night. It also means that the area is very dark when we host special events. At some future date when funds allow, a much needed project would be the addition of lighting so that the area can be adequately lit in the evening, during special events, and on cloudy days.

Another issue with the entry area relates to the automatic doors. The design of the doors is such that both the inner and outer doors are open at the same time. The distance between these doors is fairly short so one set does not close before the other one opens. The result is that during the winter, cold air seeps into the building each time the doors open. It doesn't take long for the first floor to become quite frigid when the temperature drops. This would be okay if the first floor were only a passageway with no expectation that people would be there for an extended time; however, that is not the case. Beyond the people who congregate in the area to wait for friends, gather their belongings, or carry on conversations, staff in the circulation department must be in that area at all hours of the day and night. It is quite uncomfortable for them to work in the area during the winter months. We need to have a heating system installed between the doors so that the air entering the building can be warmed before it reaches the inner areas of the building.

The HVAC system has presented another problem for us. While large buildings seem to be prone to HVAC problems, it appears that ours are exacerbated by the type of HVAC system that was chosen for this building. The system is apparently very sophisticated and quite different from any other system on campus. It appears that no one on campus has the technical expertise to properly service this system. Beyond the most basic service, a contractor has to be called in and a separate bill is incurred. When the McWherter library experiences HVAC problems, it often takes a long time to get them corrected. Seldom can it be said that the temperature is truly comfortable in this building. This is not only uncomfortable for employees but these temperature fluctuations increase the deterioration rates of library resources. This situation seems to have improved over the last year with University Physical Plant staff being more responsive to our calls. We hope this continues during summer 2004.

One of the cost saving steps that was implemented during the building process was to not complete the building wiring for the campus network. In many cases, data ports were installed in the wall but no wiring was run to connect them to the campus network. Thus in certain parts of the building network access is non-existent. This affects library users, especially, in that many of the inactive data ports are in the public areas. The inability to easily access the campus network has been a real problem for us. It has created a hindrance to staff productivity in that it has been impossible for staff to connect a computer and work directly with the collections in the stacks. This capability is critical to cleaning up our online database, conducting a meaningful collection inventory, and correcting problems with records of items already on the shelves. The installation of the wireless network during this past year will be a great help to us. Now we only need to have the funds to purchase laptop computers that can be used by staff who need to work in the stacks.

B. Space - McWherter Library and Branch Facilities
The services and resources of the University Libraries are distributed across six different buildings. Five of these buildings are on the main campus and one is located in downtown Memphis.

McWherter Library
McWherter Library is the main library of the system. It houses the largest portion of the collections and the major departments of the University Libraries. Most of the libraries' faculty and staff are located in the McWherter building. Because the building was significantly downsized during the planning and building process, McWherter Library was never large enough to hold all that it was intended to house. The McWherter building provides 195,000 square feet of assignable space. When the move was made from the old building, a large number of resources was left behind because there was not enough space in this building.

As the regional depository for Federal Documents for the state of Tennessee, we are required to maintain a substantial repository of federal documents to be made available to the general public as well as to other depository libraries throughout the state. Much of this historical collection remains in the Brister building because that is the only storage space available to us.   The current condition of the Brister building makes it very difficult to work with and/or retrieve those materials.

Soon after the new building was occupied, the decision was made to integrate into the Libraries what was then known as the Learning Materials Center (LMC). Because this change had not been planned for, the integration of this collection into McWherter Library further reduced the amount of space available to house services and collections that were planned for the new building. Moreover, because that unit had not been

included in the building planning, no provisions had been made for housing and providing access to the special types of materials that were included in that collection. It also created an access problem because there was no time to plan for an orderly integration of that collection into that of the University Libraries. Many of the resources from the former Learning Materials Center have yet to be added to our online catalog.

Branch Libraries
The branch libraries are all operating in spaces that are inadequate to house the collections, the staff, and library users.   In addition to being too small, the environmental conditions are very poor, and security is non-existent.

Audiology and Speech-Language Pathology Library
The Audiology and Speech Language Pathology Library supports the study and teaching of the students and faculty of that school. It is located on the lower level of the ASPL building and occupies approximately 850 square feet of space. The collection consists of subscriptions to 70 periodical titles and 8,154 bound volumes. Because this program is located downtown and is physically separated from the main campus by several miles, the existence of this branch library is easily justifiable. It is unfortunate that there is not adequate space too house this branch. This library is much too small to properly house the collection that supports the Audiology and Speech Language Pathology programs. There is not enough room to house the library materials or the staff, much less provide workspace for library users. There is no room for collection growth in this library. There is seating space for only 10 library users. Additionally, the space that the library occupies provides absolutely no security for the collection. There is no lockable door to the library space, thus whether or not there is staff in the facility, the collection is always open to building occupants.

Chemistry Library.
The Chemistry Library opened in 1970 and is located on the third floor of Smith Hall. It occupies approximately 2900 square feet of space. The collection consists of approximately 170 current periodical subscriptions and 33,262 bound volumes. The collections in this library almost completely fill the shelves. There is no room for collection growth. There are two full time staff members assigned to the Chemistry Library. Because one of these two also fills in at other branches when assigned staff must be away, this library is often staffed by only one person. Library personnel staff this branch from 8 am to 4:30 pm, Monday through Friday. Historically, Chemistry faculty have been issued keys to this library and simply help themselves when the library is not staffed. As might be expected, this creates serious problems with inventory control

and collection security. Circulation records for this branch library are extremely unreliable.

Math Library
Opened in 1982, the Math Library is located on the third floor of Dunn Hall. It occupies approximately 2,300 square feet of space. The collection consists of 30,113 bound volumes and 40 current periodical subscriptions. In response to collection growth some years ago, the library acquired an annex room, which is across the hall from the original library. Because there is a single staff member in the branch library, having the collection split between two locations is a real problem. She cannot be in both rooms simultaneously and locking one while she is in the other inhibits use of the collections. The Library Assistant assigned to the Math Library normally works 8 am to 4:30 pm, Monday through Friday. When funds allow, student workers are hired to staff the library until 7pm, Monday through Thursday and on Saturday from 1 pm until 4 pm. As with other branch libraries, the departmental faculty have been issued keys to this library. They freely come and go whenever it is convenient to them. This has created serious security problems. Faculty are supposed to use the key privileges for their own research needs only and they are supposed to make sure the door is locked when they leave. On numerous occasions, the library has been left unlocked or unauthorized individuals have been allowed to enter the library after hours. A recent inventory check revealed 122 books that are missing from the collection of this branch library with no explanation.

Music Library
The Music library opened in 1970 and is the largest of the branch libraries. It occupies approximately 3,800 square feet of space on the first floor of the Music building. The collection (including 42,782 bound volumes, 13,201 phonorecords, and 2,830 audio compact discs) has out grown the available space and the staff has had to be very creative with trying to rearrange the space to try to fit more into the space. There has been a longstanding problem with high humidity in this library. Severe mold is a reoccurring problem that threatens the Music Library's collection.

Earth Sciences Library - affiliated library
The Earth Sciences library occupies a major portion of the Earth Quake Center on Central Avenue. It houses collections (including 18,352 bound volumes) related to geology, earth sciences, and geography. This library has had problems with leaks from various pipes. It has outgrown the available space for collections and has virtually no room for growth. It has long straddled the fence between being a part of the University Libraries and being a part of the department that initially created it.

This library was initially created as a part of a grant funded project in 1991, consequently, this library never went through the process of being evaluated against the criteria for a potential branch library. It was funded by the grant and initially operated separately from the University Libraries. In 1994, as efforts were being made to reduce library costs, the decision was made to transfer to the Earth Sciences Library the Geology resources previously housed in the Engineering branch library. While there were discussions about making the combined library a full branch of the University Libraries system, no transition plan was ever developed. In spite of the fact the our budget has paid for some of the materials that are housed in that library and we provide online catalog support, this library functioned almost totally independent from the University Libraries until 1999 when Annelle Huggins as Interim Library Director, made an effort to establish a working relationship with the librarian who was then employed in that library. This relationship was still in the fledgling stages when the department decided to eliminate the librarian's position during the 2000/2001 academic year. There has been no permanent staff in the Earth Sciences Library since then.

C. Storage
When McWherter Library was initially conceived, it was thought that it would be the final solution to the Libraries' space needs. In particular, it was thought that there would no longer be a need for library storage space. This was an erroneous assumption that proves each year to be further and further from the truth. Virtually no storage space was incorporated into the McWherter building and that is a continuing problem. Because our collections are continuing to grow and change, the Libraries will have an ongoing need for storage space into eternity.   Collection growth is a natural part of fulfilling our role as a research library. Unlike libraries that do not have a research mission, we are not able to discard materials simply because they address a topic that is no longer timely. There are many items in our collections that we need to keep but not necessarily house in the active collection. Because they are used infrequently, these items don't have to be on the active shelves in the University Libraries. A remote storage location is appropriate for housing these materials that can be made available within 24 hours on demand.

Since the move into the McWherter building, approximately 17,000 square feet of the Brister building has been retained by the Libraries to fill the void created by our need for a storage facility. Many library resources remain housed in that building. Library staff will retrieve these items when a library user requests them; however, because of the current condition of the building, it is a poor substitute for a storage facility. There is no climate control or security.   The windows are often left open and the place is extremely dirty and dusty because of the construction that has been going on. There have been several leaks from the pipes causing

extensive water damage. Moreover the lighting is so poor that staff must carry flashlights in order to see. The elevator stopped working several months ago and the stairwells are dark and dank. Neither personnel nor library collections are safe in that building. While part of the building is being renovated as a part of the new student services center, the part still being used by the University Libraries was not included in the renovation plan. Nor is it scheduled for renovation on any of the existing campus project lists. A major renovation of this space is needed if it is going to continue to be used to store library materials.

As a research library, we have an obligation to hold a certain amount of historical data for the various disciplines that are supported by the curriculum at the University. While some of the historical data is legitimately retained in the open stacks, a significant amount of this material does not need to reside on the active shelves. It could easily be retained in a storage facility ready to be retrieved when needed by library users. In order to have this capability, it is imperative that we have a viable and accessible storage space.   Up to now, there has been an apparent unwillingness on the part of University Administration to take this need seriously and to incorporate it into campus planning.

D. Future growth
    The hype about electronic resources would lead one to believe that a few years down the road, every bit of information that we need will be available via the Internet for free. That is not true at all. While much information is available online, much more is only available in traditional print formats. As we continue to try to build and maintain collections that meet the need of the students and faculty of the University, there will be a continuing need to add to our print holdings. Our traditional collections will continue to grow for the next several years. We will need to provide space to house these growing collections.   As it is unlikely that we will build another library or expand McWherter, we need to accommodate collection growth within our existing facilities. This need to accommodate collection growth strengthens the need for a viable storage facility.

E. Security
    Security is a major concern within the University Libraries. Because of the number of people that we serve and the number of hours that the library facilities are open to the public, we have many security issues to address. We are concerned about the safety of the people who work in the libraries, those who use the libraries, library collections, and the many additional resources that are housed in library facilities. This includes computer hardware and software, audiovisual materials, special

collections, and a variety of other specialized equipment and resources required to provide quality library services.

Since moving into the McWherter Library, there has been a definite improvement in overall building security. Library personnel and users alike feel much safer in the current building; however, there continue to be problems. Some of the recurring problems include: 1) theft of personal items of library users and staff; vandalism of library materials; library users surreptitiously staying in the building after closing; and invasion of assigned study carrels. The sheer size of the McWherter building and the hours of access are such that it will never be possible to remove all security risks.   Nonetheless, we must continue to try to make the Libraries as safe as possible. One strategy that would be helpful would be an increased presence of campus security in the library facilities. Knowing that campus security patrols the library facilities with some degree of frequency, would improve the sense of security for library personnel and library users.

III.   Staffing
A. Number of positions
At the start of the 2003 fiscal year, the University Libraries employed 26 faculty and 79 staff. Since that time the staff positions have been reduced by 3 positions that were eliminated to save money in 2003/2004. These positions are distributed across ten departments and four different buildings. The nature of the work and the responsibilities of the positions within the University Libraries have changed significantly in the past few years.

When compared to our THEC peer institutions, we have significantly fewer personnel than do other comparable libraries. The data illustrated in a Table 1 shows that our library ranks very close to the bottom. Not only do we have fewer positions but also we have fewer categories of positions to meet the many needs of an academic research library.

Institution	Professional Staff, FTE	Support Staff FTE	Student Assistants, FTE	Total FTE Staff
George Mason University	51	72	35	158
Georgia State University	49	96	28	174
University of Alabama	56	79	53	188
University of Louisville	50	91	37	178
University of Memphis	36	82	17	135
University of Mississippi	47	45	122	214

University of South Carolina	78	118	96	292
Virginia Commonwealth University	41	81	19	141
University of Houston	15	18	3	36
University of Arkansas	43	68	31	142

The one category of employee that tends to be utilized extensively by most academic libraries has been used only on a limited basis here. Student workers fill only a small number of positions within the University Libraries, because the static budget has not supported the hiring of more student workers. The student budget was totally unfunded in the year that I arrived on campus. I have been able to create a student worker budget and each year I have been able to increase the Libraries' allocation for student workers. This year, we will spend approximately $30,000 on student workers. This is in comparison to $120,000 that was spent each year on student workers at my previous institution, in a much smaller library operation.   There are many, many jobs that students could do for the University Libraries, if we had the money to pay them. This dearth of student workers means that full time staff must spend time doing many of the jobs traditionally assigned to student workers. It also means that many tasks that should be done cannot be done. This affects overall productivity of the various departments of the Libraries.

This very low student worker level also affects the relationship between the Libraries and the student body. Because the library is most often one of the largest student employers on a campus, many students have the opportunity to work in the library during their stay on campus. Traditionally, many college students learn about the library because they have the opportunity to work in the library at some time during their college experience.   Beyond the pay that they earn, their work experience enhances their academic experience and gives them a lasting relationship with the library. Because of our low funding, few of our students have this opportunity.   Working in the library is not a significant part of the student experience on this campus.

B. Classifications and compensation
   In 1998, the University contracted with an external company to undertake a comprehensive compensation study. This was the opportunity to bring position descriptions and responsibilities up to date and in line with other positions requiring comparable skills and expertise. Unfortunately for library personnel, positions were described so poorly that those evaluating the responsibilities saw little of the real nature of the jobs that are performed in the Libraries. Consequently, several positions were downgraded while others that require advanced skills and capabilities were lumped in with clerical positions. Most of the staff positions in the University Libraries require high levels of technical skills and specialized

expertise. These are not positions that can be performed adequately by anyone who walks in off the street. The skills and expectations for these positions have increased significantly in recent years. And yet, the decision was made by the Human Resources Department to eliminate the educational requirements for most of the libraries' staff positions. The high school diploma is now the required educational background for most of the staff position in the libraries. This is grossly inadequate and makes it very difficult to hire and retain the caliber of employee that is needed to do the increasingly complex and sophisticated jobs that are essential to the success of the modern academic library.

 Moreover, because the educational requirements were eliminated, the positions are ranked very low on the compensation scales. The compensation levels are so poor that we cannot hire people with the background and skills that we need to do the jobs responsibly. Additionally, because of the poor compensation, many of the Libraries' staff is compelled to work second jobs in order to maintain a livable income. In addition to making these staff feel severely undervalued, the preponderance of second jobs has a direct effect on the quality of the work that is done in the Libraries and the level of commitment to the organization. It is very hard for our staff to give us 100% when they have to save enough of themselves to be able to perform adequately on a second job. We will never be able to be what we need to be until we are able to hire fully qualified staff and compensate them accordingly. It is critical that steps be taken to improve the compensation for Libraries personnel.

While the hourly and classified staff are most severely affected by the compensation issue, it has been a long-standing problem for Libraries faculty as well. While we have high expectations for credentials, knowledge, and expertise, our salaries have traditionally been among the lowest in the country for librarians holding an ALA accredited MLS and working in academic libraries.   Library faculty salaries have been improved as a result of the very recent attention to faculty salaries but Libraries faculty salaries still lag far behind faculty salaries on the campus as a whole.

Salary inadequacies have a direct impact on the quality of our applicant pools when we try to fill vacant positions. Often we have to post vacancies multiple times in order to develop a viable pool of applicants. Even after finally getting reasonable pool of applicants we find that our strongest applicants are looking for significantly more money than we are able to pay.

C. Training & development
Because of the rapid changes in the field of librarianship, ongoing training and development are essential for maintaining the skills and expertise of

the faculty and staff of the University Libraries. Nevertheless, up to now, opportunities for training and development have been very limited. Funds have not been made available to support staff training and development. Nor have faculty and staff been aggressively encouraged to pursue training and development opportunities.   The result has been that few libraries' personnel have had opportunities to pursue the types of training and development that will enable them to remain current on the new and emerging trends in library services.   Few have had the opportunity to visit other libraries and meet their counterparts in other institutions.   Coupled with the fact that many of our staff have not worked in another library, this lack of training and development opportunities has been a real hindrance to overall organizational effectiveness. Consequently, our services and programs tend to be outdated and many of our policies and procedures are grounded in a bygone era.

It is essential that the faculty and staff of the University Libraries receive appropriate support so that they can take advantage of available training and development. One of my ongoing priorities is to provide increased funding to support professional development and training for Libraries personnel. The challenge in this is two fold. First, it has been so long without money to support training and staff development that most Libraries personnel have stopped seeking such opportunities. Second, it is now difficult to get personnel excited about being able to receive the training and professional development needed for their jobs. Many who have been here for years without receiving adequate training see little need to pursue such opportunities.

In the time since I have been here, I have made a conscious effort to make funds available to allow the faculty and staff of the Libraries to pursue professional development and training. Each year, I have been able to increase the amount available to support this need. Even when we are facing the prospects of decreased funding, the need for ongoing training and development is so critical, that this is an area that we cannot afford to cut. If we are to be able to meet the needs of library users, we must develop and maintain the skills and expertise of our faculty and staff.

D. Morale
    In my early meetings with libraries' faculty and staff, one of the most frequently voiced concerns was the overall low morale of Libraries' personnel. While individually several of the faculty and staff exhibit quite high morale, there is no collective good morale. The problem is decidedly more pervasive among staff than among the faculty, but it is certainly not limited to the staff. This situation seems to stem from the combination of a number of factors, none of which can singly be blamed for lowering morale. First among these is the fact that salaries are extremely low in the

Libraries. Both faculty and staff salaries are decidedly lower than salaries for comparable positions at other institutions. Faculty salaries are among the lowest on the campus. Even those faculty who have been here for many years, and worked very hard have been very poorly compensated. Staff salaries are significantly lower than the low salaries of Libraries faculty. Considering the levels of responsibility that the Libraries staff are required to assume and the expertise they must maintain, their compensation is well out of alignment. Second, there has historically been a serious schism between the faculty and staff within the University Libraries. Faculty and staff have not worked together well. Nor has the effort been made to establish a clear understanding of the differences in their respective roles in the organization. Consequently, many staff feels that they are doing the same jobs as the faculty and yet being paid considerably less.

The separation between faculty and staff has inhibited their learning about each other's respective responsibilities. Moreover, until recently there were few internal committees or task forces that bought faculty and staff together to work in concert to address library matters.   Third, library faculty and staff have not been actively engaged in the decision-making processes of the libraries. There have not been mechanisms in place to encourage Libraries faculty and staff to routinely provide input into planning the programs and services of the organization. Thus the faculty and staff have not fully developed a true sense of ownership for library services. Fourth, communication throughout the organization has been quite poor. Information has not routinely been shared with faculty and staff so they have often felt they did not know what is going on and were left in the dark. Staff meetings have not been a regular part of the organization until recently.   Electronic mail and the intranet have not been fully exploited as communication devices. Only within the last two years have we begun to make effective use of these new technologies as part of the organizational culture. Even now, it is not easy for some of our faculty and staff to incorporate these tools into their daily routines.

IV.   Funding
    A. General
       The *Standards for University Libraries: Evaluation of Performance* (See Attachment B), which were approved by the Association of College and Research Libraries in 1989, recommend that an adequately funded academic library will receive at least 6% of the institution's budget. This level of funding allows for building strong collections, developing personnel, and supporting appropriate services and programs. Our funding level has never approached the recommended level. Library expenditures currently account for approximately 2.7% of the University's annual budget of $245 million dollars. During the fiscal year that just closed,

FY03, total library expenditures were approximately $6.6 million. There has been no significant change in library funding in the past five years.

The overall University Libraries' budget is comprised of three components: the acquisitions budget, the operating budget, and the discretionary budget. The acquisitions budget is that part of the Libraries' funding that is used to acquire library resources. The operating budget is that part of the Libraries' funding that pays for all the other ongoing library expenses. It covers all the day-to-day expenses of managing, housing, processing, and providing access to the resources that are purchased with the acquisitions budget. It covers expenses for personnel, supplies, equipment, training, travel, telecommunications, public relations and marketing, processing, preservation and so forth.

B. Acquisitions budget

The Acquisitions budget is the part of the budget that typically gets the most attention from those outside of the Libraries. The growth and development of library collections of all types are dependent upon the acquisitions budget. It includes funds used to purchase books, periodicals, electronic resources, and microforms. It also covers the cost of licenses that allow our library users to access certain electronic or print materials for a period of time. Any information resource that is acquired to be added to the libraries' collections, either permanently or temporarily, is typically purchased on the acquisitions budget. Tables 2 through 5 that follow show the changes in the Libraries' budget over the 12-year period from 1989 to 2003.

Object Codes		89/90		90/91		91/92		92/93	
		Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised
8511	Books	400,000	300,992	322,000	250,423	285,000	300,351	519,596	400,431
8513	Standing Orders	150,000	180,509	183,000	199,000	183,000	173,158	183,000	199,756
8520	Periodicals	627,000	830,694	880,000	982,000	880,000	942,775	895,000	1,052,126
8530	Binding	40,377	41,478	40,377	40,377	40,377	68,377	45,681	61,119
8550	Microform	30,000	195,634	65,000	75,271	65,000	168,484	71,600	157,483
8590	Other	0	8,914	3,000	3,000	3,000	193	3,000	2,611
Total Acq Budget		1,247,377	1,558,221	1,493,377	1,550,071	1,456,377	1,653,338	1,717,877	1,873,526
Acq Budget % change				20%	-1%	-2%	7%	18%	13%
Total with Operating Budget		3,677,813	4,091,468	4,034,789	4,186,257	3,949,096	4,300,153	4,237,185	4,641,542
Overall % change				10%	2%	-2%	3%	7%	8%

Table 2

Object Codes		93/94 Original	93/94 Revised	94/95 Original	94/95 Revised	95/96 Original	95/96 Revised	96/97 Original	96/97 Revised
4400	Prof/Admin (software leases)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	53,753
4900	Other (ILL)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	0	49,554
8511	Books	272,949	393,261	522,949	422,158	347,020	297,842	0	382,578
8513	Standing Orders	200,000	207,771	200,000	218,424	250,800	229,531	0	245,113
8520	Periodicals	1,170,000	1,161,866	1,170,000	1,363,572	1,480,518	1,552,847	0	1,647,685
8530	Binding	61,594	61,585	61,594	45,790	45,000	36,813	0	76,906
8550	Microform	71,600	85,463	71,600	103,209	80,073	96,181	0	218,964
8590	Other	3,000	4,857	3,000	622	no longer used			
Total Acq Budget		1,779,143	1,914,803	2,029,143	2,153,775	2,203,411	2,213,214	0	2,674,553
Acq Bdget % change		4%	2%	14%	12%	9%	3%		21%
Total with Operating Budget		4,511,784	4,655,600	4,854,376	5,135,132	5,301,563	5,257,621	3,005,788	5,554,255
Overall % change		6%	0%	8%	10%	9%	2%	-43%	6%

Table 3

Object Codes		97/98 Original	97/98 Revised	98/99 Original	98/99 Revised	99/00 Original	99/00 Revised	00/01 Original	00/01 Revised
4400	Prof/Admin (sftwre leases)	0	141,416	0	210,242	180,160	275,565	235,386	573,193
4900	Other (ILL)	54,000	16,044	54,000	20,791	22,000	28,798	18,000	17,714
8511	Books	497,020	558,012	747,020	609,669	400,878	460,831	325,154	210,949
8513	Standing Orders	223,249	211,225	223,249	226,913	243,249	250,904	264,320	280,683
8520	Periodicals	1,480,518	1,545,573	1,480,518	1,690,864	1,908,500	1,845,383	1,904,000	1,945,163
8530	Binding	45,000	77,523	45,000	60,037	45,000	52,927	52,927	56,927
8550	Microform	80,073	265,053	80,073	227,949	80,073	156,053	80,073	142,391
Total Acq Budget		2,379,860	2,814,846	2,629,860	3,046,465	2,879,860	3,070,461	2,879,860	3,227,020
Acq Budget % change			5%	11%	8%	10%	1%	0%	5%
Total with Operating Budget		5,140,160	5,512,125	5,434,586	5,979,186	5,802,502	6,066,545	5,786,857	6,274,563
Overall % change		71%	-1%	6%	8%	7%	1%	0%	3%

Table 4

	Object Codes		01/02		02/03		03/04	
			Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised
4200	Commun/Shipping		0	381	0	1082	1500	
4400	Prof/Admin (software leases)		235,386	286,951	211,000	96,160	275,000	
4900	Other (ILL)		18,000	13,990	5,000	22,319	22,000	
8511	Books		475,154	253,581	250,000	154,192	270,000	
8513	Standing Orders		264,320	286,465	290,752	316,197	260,000	
8520	Periodicals		1,904,000	2,116,020	2,094,400	2,244,086	2,100,000	
8530	Binding		52,927	58,500	57,073	61,000	75,000	
8550	Microform		80,073	159,062	80,000	150,106	100,000	
		Total	3,029,860	3,174,950	2,988,225	3,045,142	3,103,500	
		Total with Operating Budget	6,078,442	6,287,240	6,242,431	6,161,254	6,542,398	

Table 5

While there was apparently a time when the acquisitions budget was quite strong and many thousands of dollars were available for collection development to support the teaching and research of the various departments on campus, those days ended about twenty years ago. Following a series of cuts in the 1980s and 1990s, in recent years, the acquisitions budget has remained fairly static or in lean years, it has been somewhat reduced. Even in those years when our budget shows an increase, the increase was typically not sufficient to keep up with inflation. The inflation rate on library materials has been in the 10% to 15% range for the past several years. Consequently, we have been steadily losing ground and our buying power has been decreasing. Moreover, since our overall funding level has historically been low, the modest increases that we've periodically received through the years have done little to bring us closer to an appropriate funding level. Our acquisitions budget is far below the level that should be maintained for a library of our size serving a large doctoral granting University.

Because of our funding, we have been unable to develop and maintain strong collections to support the teaching and research that occur at the university. Our monographic collection has remained relatively small because so much of the budget has had to go toward periodicals. Even with that our periodicals holdings have lagged far behind those of our peer institutions. Table 6 below, shows library purchases made during 1999 by our libraries and six peer institutions from the ASERL membership. With the exception of the University of Miami, these are

Institution	Enrollment FTE	Books Purchased	Serials Purchased
George Mason University	13,078	41,550	14,960
Georgia Institutue of Technology	13,877	5,653	8,851
Mississippi State University	13,612	18,986	12,448
University of Louisville	13,759	48,248	15,948
University of Memphis	13,364	3,714	7,640
University of Miami	12,887	23,124	15,426
University of N. Carolina, Charlotte	12,206	14,593	26,255

Table 6

all public institutions. Among this group of peer institutions, the University of Memphis is the fourth largest in enrollment, and yet our library ranks last in purchasing of books and serials. We purchased significantly fewer books and serials than the others. This result is tied directly to the libraries' level of funding.

C. Operating Budget
The operating budget is that part of the budget that pays for everything other than the purchase of library materials. It includes supplies,

				89/90		90/91		91/92		92/93	
	Object Codes			Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised
1110	Admin Salary			0	3,700	0	2,000	0	0	0	0
1210	Acad Salary			913,855	879,959	954,050	924,314	953,050	948,711	952,894	990,014
1310	Supp Salary			1,234,420	1,288,097	1,287,137	1,321,059	1,239,444	1,302,112	1,234,318	1,315,914
1410	Student Salary			92,892	90,736	100,956	94,560	100,956	97,772	83,827	88,079
3100	Travel			6,600	16,500	6,600	14,844	6,600	6,600	23,400	16,379
4100	Printing/Duplicating			15,000	18,236	15,000	17,361	15,000	14,000	15,000	19,667
4200	Communications			29,848	35,623	34,150	41,950	34,150	41,274	44,150	42,343
4300	Maintenance			90,000	81,422	89,148	99,861	89,148	110,148	89,148	108,693
4400	Prof Services			30,521	35,240	32,671	49,646	32,671	47,937	35,071	60,640
4500	Supplies			7,000	50,201	11,400	31,241	11,400	27,166	25,000	30,514
4800	Grants/Training			1,500	1,500	1,500	571	1,500	779	1,500	195
4900	Other			8,800	26,808	8,800	30,720	8,800	21,261	15,000	19,137
8110	Equipment			0	5,225	0	8,059	0	29,055	0	76,441
			Total	2,430,436	2,533,247	2,541,412	2,636,186	2,492,719	2,646,815	2,519,308	2,768,016
			Total with								
			Materials								
			Budget	3,677,813	4,091,468	4,034,789	4,186,257	3,949,096	4,300,153	4,237,185	4,641,542

Table 7

equipment, telephones, OCLC services, staff training and development, salaries and benefits, postage, binding, photocopying, etc.   The majority of the libraries' operating budget, from 80% to 90% each year, goes toward salaries and benefits for full-time permanent faculty and staff. Tables 7 through 10, show historical data on the libraries' operating budget from fiscal year 1990 through fiscal year 2003.

			93/94		94/95		95/96		96/97	
	Object Codes		Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised	Original	Revised
1110	Admin Salary		0	0	21,341	22,095	22,203	22,203	22,959	22,959
1150	Supp Pay Admin / Prof		0	0	0	675	0	0	0	0
1210	Academic / Prof Salary		991,184	909,943	1,025,617	1,003,669	1,118,141	1,037,721	1,087,239	1,086,583
1250	Supp Pay Acad/Prof		0	10,668	0	12,609	0	8,800	0	2,700
1255	Summer Comp Acad		0	0	0	700	0	1,400	0	0
1257	Grad Assts		0	35,186	0	37,209	8,188	38,738	8,188	22,515
1265	Grant Recovery		0	216	0	0	0	0	0	0
1266	Undistrib Salary		16,173	0	16,173	0	29,831	0	27,044	3,144
1310	Clerical / Supp Salary		1,304,454	1,310,017	1,341,272	1,372,462	1,420,347	1,370,570	1,441,516	1,355,537
1350	Suppl Pay Clerical		0	7,694	0	3,214	0	567	0	300
1374	Overtime Clerical		0	0	0	0	0	482	0	0
1375	Temp Emp - Clerical/Support		0	22,232	0	6,456	5,848	7,547	5,848	7,673
1410	Student Assistants		83,827	75,255	83,827	103,812	115,227	110,052	63,627	73,300
3100	Travel		23,400	22,085	23,400	25,752	25,100	25,100	25,100	26,536
4100	Printing/Duplicating		15,000	19,018	15,000	34,360	16,787	29,424	16,787	24,928
4200	Communications		52,150	47,150	52,150	67,020	76,980	76,816	76,980	76,327
4300	Maintenance		114,148	119,021	114,148	77,523	65,000	64,589	65,000	60,397
4400	Prof Services		70,071	73,280	70,071	82,136	85,000	86,203	85,000	72,843
4500	Supplies		45,734	53,340	45,734	77,682	25,000	28,651	25,000	20,194
4800	Grants/Training		1,500	2,869	1,500	523	1,500	3,198	1,500	1,521
4900	Other		15,000	10,686	15,000	5,326	83,000	99,327	54,000	2,615
8110	Equipment		0	22,137	0	48,134	0	33,019	0	19,630
		Total	2,732,641	2,740,797	2,825,233	2,981,357	3,098,152	3,044,407	3,005,788	2,879,702
		Total with Materials Budget	4,511,784	4,655,600	4,854,376	5,135,132	5,301,563	5,257,621	3,005,788	5,554,255

Table 8

With the exception of the necessary increases to cover changes in salaries and benefits, the operating budget has remained virtually the same for many years. Because the operating budget has historically been very low, the primary focus from a fiscal point of view has been on maintaining the status quo so that expenses remain within budget. There has been little flexibility or opportunity for considering the possibilities of taking on new and/ or different roles.

Object Codes			97/98			98/99			99/00			00/01	
			Original	Revised		Original	Revised		Original	Revised		Original	Revised
1110	Admin Salary		22,959	16,741		23,418	21,344		22,432	43,686		45,618	58,656
1150	Supp Pay Admin / Prof		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
1210	Academic / Prof Salary		1,089,203	1,055,329		1,117,644	1,086,341		1,165,008	1,035,669		1,165,008	1,134,038
1250	Supp Pay Acad/Prof		0	750		0	0		0	0		0	0
1255	Summer Comp Acad		0	0		0	0		0	400		0	0
1257	Grad Assts		8,188	17,927		8,188	21,370		11,543	23,270		11,543	1
1265	Grant Recovery		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0
1266	Undistrib Salary		13,355	0		13,355	0		0	0		0	0
1275	Temp Emp - Acad / Prof		0	0		0	0		0	0		0	7,263
1310	Clerical / Supp Salary		1,351,228	1,250,960		1,366,754	1,319,842		1,429,536	1,329,255		1,390,705	1,399,701
1350	Suppl Pay Clerical		0	1,000		0	0		0	54		0	0
1374	Overtime Clerical		0	0		0	32		3,000	5,532		3,000	3,000
1375	Temp Emp - Clerical/Support		0	6,558		0	3,212		0	2,070		0	0
1410	Student Assistants		30,000	38,611		30,000	52,351		45,756	35,440		39,582	24,922
3100	Travel		15,100	21,740		15,100	37,221		15,100	28,054		11,216	35,872
4100	Printing/Duplicating		16,787	20,537		16,787	14,637		16,787	20,497		14,497	12,797
4200	Communications		66,980	85,935		66,980	74,019		78,980	70,805		86,878	60,178
4300	Maintenance		55,000	55,000		55,000	59,232		55,000	68,538		52,000	56,000
4400	Prof Services		85,000	75,000		85,000	61,000		73,000	81,309		83,950	135,425
4500	Supplies		5,000	25,326		5,000	112,487		5,000	209,184		3,000	72,687
4600	Rent		0	0		0	0		0	244		0	24
4800	Grants/Training		1,500	3,488		1,500	4,790		1,500	6,646		0	3,540
4900	Other		0	609		0	339		0	30,345		0	27,720
5290	Motor Vehicle		0	0		0	0		0	20		0	2,534
8110	Equipment		0	21,768		0	64,504		0	5,066		0	13,185
		Total	2,760,300	2,697,279		2,804,726	2,932,721		2,922,642	2,996,084		2,906,997	3,047,543
Operating Budget % change						1.6%	8.7%		4.2%	2.2%		-0.5%	1.7%
		Total with											
		Materials											
		Budget	5,140,160	5,512,125		5,434,586	5,979,186		5,802,502	6,066,545		5,786,857	6,274,563
overall % change						5.7%	8.5%		6.8%	1.5%		-0.3%	3.4%

Table 9

			01 / 02			02/03			03/04	
	Object Codes		Original	Revised		Original	Revised		Original	Revised
1110	Admin Salary		89,232	93,820		96,177	98,818		101,458	
1210	Academic / Prof Salary		1,256,645	1,226,002		1,353,950	1,291,675		1,471,957	
1257	Grad Assts		0	0		0	0		0	
1275	Temp Emp - Acad / Prof		0	0		0	11,934		0	
1310	Clerical / Supp Salary		1,410,352	1,327,873		1,468,018	1,323,384		1,431,915	
1374	Overtime Clerical		3,000	4,798		3,000	3,686		4,000	
1375	Temp Emp - Clerical/Support		0	237		0	0		0	
1410	Student Assistants		37,812	8,008		10,000	17,429		50,000	
3100	Travel		11,216	35,862		25,000	37,253		40,000	
4100	Printing/Duplicating		14,497	12,000		14,000	9,609		15,000	
4200	Communications		86,878	62,875		89,000	62,859		70,000	
4300	Maintenance		52,000	54,318		55,000	50,352		52,000	
4400	Prof Services		83,950	125,606		86,000	84,649		91,368	
4500	Supplies		3,000	95,064		15,000	78,612		58,000	
4800	Grants/Training		0	11,280		8,000	5,567		10,000	
4900	Other		0	28,327		20,000	24,828		22,000	
5290	Motor Vehicle		0	1,061		1,061	530		1,200	
8110	Equipment		0	25,159		10,000	14,927		20,000	
		Total	3,048,582	3,112,290		3,254,206	3,116,112		3,438,898	
		Total with								
		Materials								
		Budget	6,078,442	6,287,240		6,242,431	6,161,254		6,542,318	

Table 10

The Libraries' low funding has not only limited the growth of collections but it has also restricted the addition and development of services and programs. When our peer libraries have launched new services, we have not had the flexibility in our budget to be able to participate in such initiatives. We have most often had to watch from the sidelines as our peer libraries have embarked on new endeavors. We belong to organizations such as ASERL and SOLINET but we are not able to fully participate in the programs and activities of the organizations because we have never had the necessary funding.

D. Discretionary Budget

The discretionary budget is derived from those funds that come from sources other than the annual allocated budget. It includes revenue received from charging for certain services, gifts, and funds raised through the efforts of our development office. This has been a relatively small part of the funds available to the University Libraries.

Revenue

The libraries have received revenue from charges for copies of materials out of Special Collections or from the commercial use of materials for which the Libraries holds the copyright. In most years, this combined total adds up to no more than a few hundred dollars.

The fines and fees collected by academic libraries are often a source of revenue for the library. These funds are usually available to the library to use as needed. In my previous library experiences, monies collected as library fines and fees have been used for a variety of things including: to purchase replacements for lost library materials; to purchase needed equipment; to fund training and development needs; to fund building renovations; and to fund other library needs not provided for in the normal operating budget. The amounts collected as library fines and fees can amount to 10s of thousands of dollars and can enable the library to have some of the fiscal so desperately flexibility needed to be effective. Unfortunately, the way the fines and fees are accounted for at this institution, they have not been available for the Libraries to use. In fact rather than gaining funds because of the collection of fines and fees, the Libraries loses money from its operating budget each year. Instead of being considered additional funds, the fines and fees collected by the University Libraries are counted into the budget process before they are even collected.

In addition, a few years ago, the University's Bursar's Office began charging the library a bad debt fee. This fee amounts to approximately $20,000 each year; this amount is deducted from our operating budget by the Bursar's Office. The University Libraries has never been given a reasonable explanation why this fee has been imposed. Typically a bad debt fee would imply that certain debts are uncollectible and therefore are being written off. There has never been any discussion of adopting such a practice. Nor have any outstanding library debts been written off. These debts continue to be carried on our records.

Gifts
The University Libraries receive cash donations in the form of gifts from the Friends of Libraries or individuals. Some of these gifts come as a result of the University's annual giving campaign. Others may honor special occasions or particular people. Gifts of this nature may add a few thousand dollars to the libraries' coffers each year. We also receive an appreciable number of non-monetary gifts each year. Most of these come as donations of books or other materials that might be added to the Libraries' collections. While we welcome these gifts of collections, they often present a new set of problems for us. When they are large collections or collections of unique materials, we often are unable to process them because we do not have enough staff to handle the work required to process these added materials. We are also reaching the time when we need to be concerned about the dwindling space available in our Special Collections area to properly house and handle the special materials.

A related issue that continues to plague us is the historical practice of departments and programs engaging in negotiation for gifts of collections without involving Libraries personnel. As a result of this practice we have

ended up with some large backlogs of collections of materials that require special handling but we have nether neither the funds nor the personnel to process them. Current faculty and staff in Special Collections chip away at this processing as time permits but this a very slow process.   In recent years, there has been an increasing awareness that negotiations for such gifts of collections must consider more than the simple acceptance. Consideration must also be given to securing funds to support the processing and maintenance of these collections as well as the physical housing and the necessary security.

Research Overhead

Overhead on research is a standard source of revenue for institutions of higher education. The overhead is most often split between the individuals and the departments engaging in the research and the entities that support the research either directly or indirectly. Because of the importance of library resources and services in most research universities, it is pretty typical for the university's library to be included among those who receive a portion of the overhead distribution. Because there is a recognition that the resources needed to support research are often very different from those needed to support teaching, the overhead distribution provides a source of specialized funding for the library. This distribution often provides the funds that enable the library to purchase resources that specifically support research as opposed to teaching. To date, the University Libraries has not been included in the overhead distribution at the University of Memphis. An opportunity exists to explore this possibility.

Development Efforts

Development is an area of major weakness for the University Libraries. While there is great need and good potential, to date, the University Libraries has not been a major player in the University's development program.   The University's development program has historically focused very heavily on the academic colleges with primary attention being given to constituent fund raising. Because the University Libraries does not offer degrees, it does not fit very neatly into the constituent fund raising model. Nor has the University adopted the philosophy held at many other institutions that all students of the University are constituents of the University Libraries. Consequently, we have essentially been omitted from the overall development program. For instance, it took months to get the University Libraries added to the online form that allow donors to give gifts to various segments of the University. Most often the Libraries has not been included in development efforts or we get included as an after thought usually as a result of my complaints.

Theoretically, we have been assigned a Director of Development (DOD) who is supposed to work with us to further our development agenda. In reality, the

DOD assigned to work with the University Libraries does not have the time to devote to our needs because she also has responsibility for the College of Education and the University College. The College of Education is one of the largest on campus and has major development needs. The University College is both large and non-traditional. All three of these units have gotten new deans within the last few years and all are gearing up new development efforts. This is a very big job for one person to take on – too big. Since we, in the University Libraries, are starting out with virtually no development program, we need a substantial amount of development attention; we have not been able to get that attention under the current arrangement.   Library develop can be very successful; many other institutions have demonstrated the value of a meaningful library focused development effort.   However, library development is sufficiently different from development for academic colleges that it requires a different approach. It cannot be approached as if it is just another college to which the college constituent program can be applied.

I would welcome the opportunity to work with a development director who is not pulled in three directions at once and who has the time to learn about the particulars of library development. A development officer who really has the time to focus on our needs and pursue opportunities could make a tremendous difference for us. I think there is the potential to be able to raise some real funds for the University Libraries if we are able to mount an effective program. That will only happen if there is support from the leaders of the University's Advancement Division as well as the University Administration and a willingness to devote a reasonable amount of human effort and other resources to developing and supporting a library focused development program.

V.   Integration into University Life

A. Current image
The image of the University Libraries is not in total disrepair but neither is it extremely strong. The unfortunate truth is that for so many on campus, the Libraries has not really been thought of at all or at most is an after thought. Staff who work in other offices on campus are often surprised to hear that they can check out books from the library. Many students have reached their junior and senior years and admit to not having used the Libraries for any of their course assignments. Some faculty have not ventured into the Libraries either because they think they know all they need to now about the library or they are intimidated by the many changes in libraries. Efforts in recent years have been devoted to getting more information out to the students, faculty, and staff so that they know what the libraries offer and feel comfortable with making use of the libraries.

B. Inclusion in campus life

As an organization, we have not participated in most of the events and activities that occur on campus. Historically we were not routinely included in most of the planning and decision-making that occurred on campus. This is slowly changing as a result of the leadership position being designated as a dean. By virtue of the designation of the leadership position as a deanship, the Libraries Dean is included in many central University meetings and activities. As a Dean, I get to participate in the decision making process on a regular basis. This puts the Libraries at the table more often than before and gives us the opportunity to receive more information first hand. Our inclusion is definitely improving although the change is slow on some fronts. There are still times when I learn, after the fact, about information that I have not received that has been sent to the deans or events to which the other deans have been invited but I have not. This omission is most obvious when offices outside of Academic Affairs are responsible for the distribution of information.

C. Visibility
Beyond the fact that the University Libraries has not been included in many University activities, as an organization the University Libraries has maintained a very low profile on campus. We've not participated in many campus celebrations or activities. Nor has programming for the public been a real priority for the University Libraries. There has not been a tendency to reach out to library users or to create reasons for users to come to the library. Nor has the Libraries made much of an effort to promote itself or to otherwise increase its visibility.

This is changing slowly as in recent years the Libraries has actively participated in campus activities that provide an opportunity to showcase our services and resources. Moreover, the University Libraries has sponsored several programs that attract a broad audience from across the campus and the community. These programs have brought people into the library that might not have otherwise come. Additionally, specific attention has been devoted to publicizing the activities and accomplishments of the faculty and staff of the University Libraries.

Improved visibility is important for the University Libraries. It will help others to think about the Libraries more often. It also will strengthen our position on campus.

D. Perception across campus
While the Libraries seems to be fairly well thought of across the campus, it is perceived very differently by different segments of the campus. Many of the faculty who have been here for a very long time, hold on to a negative perception that they developed years ago. It appears that at one time the Libraries wasn't very good at meeting faculty needs. Some faculty who became disenchanted during that time have not ventured back

to give the Libraries another try. Reaching this group is in many respects the hardest task of all. Because we still can't promise them everything, it is hard to convince them that we really can meet most of their needs. This is an ongoing struggle that may only be won with the passage of time.

Many of the newer faculty who have had the opportunity to get to know some of the Libraries faculty and take advantage of some of our newer services and resources, are pleased with the services and resources that they receive. While they recognize that we have limitations, they also recognize that we are very resourceful and can usually get whatever they need. These faculty are some of our greatest supporters. Not only are they library users but also they bring their classes to the Libraries and give assignments that require their students to use library resources.

In the library community, our Libraries is very well respected. Because ours is one of the largest academic libraries in this region, we are often looked to to provide leadership in library matters. Our faculty members are often called on to chair committees or task forces dealing with regional library issues. Librarians from our library often serve in leadership roles for state and local library organizations. Librarians from other institutions have healthy professional respect for our Libraries faculty and look to them for advice and guidance on a variety of issues.

The perception of the University Libraries is generally good across the campus. The overall image is slowly changing and improving as changes are being made in the relationship of the University Libraries to the rest of the institution.

VI.   Conclusion
The University Libraries plays an important role in helping the University to achieve its educational and research missions. To support the teaching, research, and learning that occur on the campus, it is critical that the University Libraries be strong. It is often said that there cannot be a great university without there also being a great library. As the University of Memphis strives to achieve greatness as an institution, it is critical that the University Libraries be supported in a manner that will support its also becoming a great library. We have the foundation in place and we've made great strides in that direction. Much more work is needed to enable us to achieve that goal.