A Partnership Approach to Multi-Campus Library Services

Min Tong (mtong@mail.ucf.edu)
Regional Campus Libraries, University of Central Florida

Cynthia Kisby (ckisby@mail.ucf.edu)
Regional Campus Libraries, University of Central Florida

Abstract

With more than 50,000 students taking courses at twelve campus locations as well as online, the University of Central Florida (UCF) is one of the ten largest universities in the United States, based on enrollment. This multi-campus university system uses strategic integration of physical and virtual assets to deliver regional library services. Partnership agreements govern operations and service issues across all library functions, including collection development, cataloging, and interlibrary loan. In this environment, an organizational culture that fosters team building, flexibility, training, and all varieties of communication, and one that includes a strategic integration of new technology to improve channels of communication and collaboration opportunities is vital.

Keywords: Partnership; Collaboration; Multi-campus university system; Joint-use libraries

Introduction

Based on the multiple experiences of the University of Central Florida (UCF) in establishing partnership agreements, this paper aims to provide a framework (rather than a step by step, systematic guide) for inquiry and decision-making processes that could be considered in creating cooperative library agreements. By way of overview, UCF is a rapidly-growing metropolitan university focused on fulfilling students' expectations for a quality, accredited degree while at the same time providing enough flexibility to allow students to meet their employment and family obligations. Like many other universities, UCF partially meets this challenge through online programs and course offerings at branch campuses. Unlike many other institutions, UCF has developed collaborative agreements with regional community colleges to offer convenient, local access to bachelors and masters degree programs. With approximately 20 percent of UCF student credit hours offered on regional campuses and via the Internet, the traditional methods of providing library services are not always effective.

In order to enhance and personalize library services, UCF uses a network of relationships with partner libraries to help meet students' needs. UCF Libraries' success in supporting ever-expanding educational opportunities is a direct result of careful cultivation of interpersonal relationships and strategic integration of technology. The discussion that follows deals with various types of inter-library agreements, outlines strategies for building a strong collaborative team of library employees, and indicates some of the measures of success. It is hoped that the experience of UCF in developing multi-campus library services can be helpful to other libraries moving in a similar direction.

General Context

Multi-campus universities are complex organizations that require carefully crafted and detailed management systems to govern the many-faceted relationships of the main and regional campuses. This requirement extends to the libraries that serve these institutions. A definition of a "regional campus" is provided by a federal office that oversees all accrediting agencies, specifical-

ly, "any location of an institution, other than the main campus, at which the institution offers at least 50% of an educational program."[1] While the focus of this paper is on the multi-campus university, it is recognized that large public libraries with their many branch libraries, government libraries with their regional depository libraries, and other libraries with multi-service points could contribute to this discussion and help others learn from a wealth of experience and expertise. Publications on this topic undoubtedly would be welcomed since, in her article published in 2001, T. M. Schneider reports that, "little is known … about how regional campus libraries provide their services to the campus and … the wider community; these libraries have been largely neglected in the literature."[2]

Since 2001, there has been some expansion of the body of literature dealing generally with issues pertaining to regional campus libraries. Of significance, a website has been created recently by J. R. Seymour of the Maricopa County Community College Libraries in Arizona that provides a substantive listing of online resources pertaining to "Partnership Libraries Resources." It also lists "websites of joint-use/partnerships between public/academic libraries."[3] The topics covered range from establishing joint-use libraries, working in joint-use libraries, service delivery, various plans for shared use, as well as accounts of how particular joint-use libraries operate and the problems they experience. Another bibliography of literature on regional campus libraries has been compiled by the Regional Campus Libraries Discussion Group in Washington State. It identifies 49 print resources, some of them annotated, dealing with topics relevant to many aspects of library services and assessment at regional campuses as well as topics relevant to library services for distance students. There are few references, however, in any of the bibliographies consulted to the actual agreements underlying joint-use libraries and the collaborative culture that supports them. This paper hopes to help cover this lacuna.[4]

About UCF

The University of Central Florida is a metropolitan research university that ranks as the fifth largest in the nation with more than 50,000 students (see Table-1 for more detail about UCF).[5]

Table-1 University of Central Florida Fast Facts[6]

2008 Fall Enrollment	50,254 (Undergraduate: 42,912 Graduates: 7,342)
Teaching Faculty and Adjuncts	1,434
Total Employees	7,341
Library Employees	107
Library Volumes	1,897,389
All Periodical Subscriptions	18,012 (Electronic Periodicals: 11,576)
Library Databases	358

Founded in 1963 as the Florida Technological University, by 1968 its student enrollment had reached 1,948. Today, in addition to a 1,415-acre main campus, UCF maintains eleven regional campuses and formal partnerships with four community colleges in the region.[7] The University introduced the concept of partnering with community colleges more than forty years ago in order to assure access to a university degree for larger numbers of local students by leveraging the regional community college assets that were already in place. The "2+2 model" (two years at a community college and two years of upper division work at a university) has evolved into today's UCF's "DirectConnect" Program. Through this program, all Associate in Arts and Associate in Science graduates from four consortium community colleges are guaranteed admission to UCF.

As this model took hold, UCF baccalaureate and graduate programs on consortium community college campuses have increased their offerings to where more than 44 programs are now available to the thousands of students attracted to UCF.

Types of Partnership Agreements

An expansion of programs, student enrollment and number of campuses presented certain challenges for UCF Libraries. To meet these challenges, extensive and robust library partnerships proved to be the answer. Formal agreements between UCF and its partner libraries constitute the foundation of our partnerships. Without formal agreements our relationships would be at risk of failure due to misunderstandings, being overwhelmed by unexpected demands, confusion over decision-making processes, funding exigencies, and the complications related to numerous other aspects of the relationship.

A review of the literature reveals a variety of possible configurations of cooperation between libraries.[8] In formal contracts or memoranda of understanding between libraries, terms such as "joint-use," "dual-use," "cooperative," and "co-managed" are used depending on the nature and intent of the partnership. Whatever term is used, it is important to define precisely the meaning of that term, perhaps in a "preamble" or an "appendix" to the formal agreement. UCF's first partnership agreement reflected a true joint-use venture between Brevard Community College (BCC) and the University. The result was a new, jointly-built library building managed by BCC with financial support for resources and staff from the University. As student enrollment expanded to a number of new partner campuses, most of the subsequent UCF library partnership agreements have evolved into a type of "contract for services" for UCF patrons by another library. UCF uses the term "inter-institutional agreements" to describe the highest level agreement having the broadest commitments made by each partner's parent institution. Some UCF memoranda of un-

derstanding or agreements of the inter-institutional kind cover not only the big-picture issues concerning UCF's relationship with our partner community colleges but also the more detailed written policies and procedures related to library services. In some cases, library *operating* agreements between UCF and community college partners are added as an appendix or separate sub-agreement.

Clearly, library agreements can be understood in various ways. At UCF, because we deal with different types of library relationships depending on the nature of the regional campus, we found it helpful to understand agreements of three difference kinds: agreements on the institutional level (the big picture), agreements that address various specific library operations (the middle picture), and agreements that focus on library policies and procedures (the close-up picture). These are discussed in reference largely to the experience of UCF but also in reference to various other institutions having similar library agreements.

The Big Picture – Institutional Agreements

As a general rule, in the "big picture" scenario, a college or university will initiate an inter-institutional agreement to identify and account for all the *major* aspects of the partnership. For example, a document called an "inter-local agreement" between a Board of County Commissioners in Florida and a community college is used to outline the construction and operation of a new joint-use library. This document defines which entity owns the land and the building and which entity will be responsible for its operations. General provisions of the agreement cover funding, building design, construction timelines, furnishing and equipment expectations. A detailed section on library operation and administration spells out the organizational and reporting structures, maintenance responsibilities, hours of operation, collections and services, and other operational details. The point is that agreements can be written at any level of specificity, but where a high-level, "big-picture" scenario

constitutes the agreement itself, details of the library operations themselves may need to be addressed in addenda or appendices. The highest level "big picture" agreement should include a process for dispute resolution, dissolution of the agreement, liabilities and insurance policies, and compliance with any relevant legal requirements.

Of course, the UCF approach is not the only one. As an alternative to "inter-institutional" and "inter-local" agreements, some libraries create "inter-governmental agreements" (IGAs) to clarify aspects of a partnership operation.[9] One large private university specializing in online and distance education worked with its public library partner for two years in order to write a fifty-four page agreement.[10] Scrimgeour and Potter provide an excellent historical perspective on the role of contracts in interlibrary cooperation in general and also describe Regis University's philosophy and process used in establishing contracts.[11] Interestingly, this institution, which has been serving online or distance students since the 1980s, finds that technology reduces the necessity for highly elaborate library service agreements. As Tom Riedel, the Distance Services Librarian at Regis University, pointed out during a phone interview with the authors that, technology has evolved to a point where so many resources are available online that negotiating for physical space and print materials may no longer make much sense. Online students could be located anywhere and may be well served by electronic resources, online interactive instruction, and chat reference. Clearly, each institution's experiences and service-delivery model will dictate the degree of formality necessary in writing and enacting partnership agreements, regardless of what they are called.

For UCF partnerships, agreements also serve essentially as the foundation for developing a culture of collaboration, and as such they focus mainly on the goals of a partnership. The value of stating mutual goals or purpose in an agreement may not become clear until a problem arises. Another benefit to having goals articulated at the inception of the agreement, is that they serve as a reminder for all parties to keep mutual benefits and a spirit of cooperation in the foreground and to not get side-tracked by issues that might undermine the overall intent. One example of this purpose-focused wording is: "WHEREAS, the County and College desire staff to operate and maintain the Library for the benefit of the general public in the Library's service area, and for the benefit of the students, faculty, and staff of College…" Another example from a university—college agreement is: "…with the understanding that both institutions recognize their obligation to the community at large to engage in cooperative efforts to increase the education opportunities…" The more specifically the expectations and goals are delineated in the agreement the easier it will be to use the agreement to evaluate the arrangement and measure the success of the project.[12]

It will come as no surprise to most academic librarians that distributed and electronic courses designed to increase student enrollment are driven by the parent organization and often presented to the library after the fact. A partnership agreement that is a result of an enrollment-growth goal of the larger institution reflects a situation quite different than two libraries coming together to mutually serve their patrons. The two different scenarios will dictate different approaches to such matters as patron identification and eligibility for various services, database authentication, collection development, and interlibrary loan. It is important to recognize these different approaches and construct the library agreement to suit the situation.

The Middle Picture – Agreements that Detail Library Operations

As a "big picture" agreement may require more detailed accounts of basic library operations, at this point the "middle picture" comes into view. For example, merging two existing libraries introduces a number of complications different from a general service agreement or where two institutions

create a brand new library with no previously existing collections, policies, or staff members to merge together. There are a staggering number of considerations that suggest that nothing less than a carefully detailed analysis and account of operations are essential. Library administrators will recognize the need for this more extensive coverage in an agreement once the key operations of partner libraries are reviewed.

Even where libraries do not formally merge but rather engage in service agreements, depending on the needs of the partners in the agreement, a good number of issues concerning services to different patron groups may need to be addressed. In agreements where a university contracts for library services from a community college, as the case has been with UCF, some services to the university clients, such as circulation of materials, may be essentially the same as those of the primary community college clientele. Other services that require significant expansion for the host library, such as access to databases and instruction concerning use, may require considerable advance planning and attention to database license compliance. If database access can be linked to the user ID and one system handles all the patrons, there should be few authorization and login issues needed to be sorted out. If patron information located in various library systems continually requires adjustments and reconciliation, the library staff members need to anticipate this, and the partnership agreement should address this exigency to forestall events that could cause stress on the partnership. Such problems as these, and more, need to be anticipated and addressed in the more detailed library agreements.

Each area of library operation requires analyses in regard to the different partner processes and how the multiple patron groups should be handled. An examination might begin with discussions about how the administrators of the partner libraries will address diverse goals of the institutions. The foundation for a partnership and everything that flows from it, of course, stems from the mission and goals of the two institutions and their libraries. Considerable time should be given to this initial phase when creating a more detailed partner library agreement. As the discussion proceeds, everything ultimately should be covered, from public and technical services to basic equipment needs and janitorial services, depending on the needs for services and the abilities of libraries to meet these needs. More specifically, these topics include the following.

1. **Mission and/or General Goals**
   Noted above. These also serve as a measure for evaluation of future success
2. **Administrative Organization and Staffing**
   Policy making
   Reporting structure
   Number and type of employees
   Single employer or multiple employer types of salaries and benefits
   Staff training
3. **Hours of Operation**
   Plan for conflicting schedules if public and academic partners observe different holidays or if academic partners operate under different academic calendars
   Employee scheduling with multiple employers
4. **Collection Acquisitions**
   Expected contribution from each partner
   Duplication policy
   Weeding or disbursement of the collection – property returns to purchaser
   Observing online license restrictions
5. **Cataloging**
   Classification schemes
   Single or multiple OPACs (Florida has two academic union catalogs.)
6. **Reference**
   Transparency is usually the goal, training is the necessity

7. **Library Instruction**
   Usually provided by each partner for its respective constituencies

8. **Circulation**
   Single or multiple systems

9. **Interlibrary Loan**
   Based on different partner eligibilities

10. **Facilities**
    Allocation and management of office, meeting, and classroom space

11. **Equipment**
    Buy, install, and maintain separate systems or pay for service

The Close-up Picture - Policies and Procedures

The "close-up" picture essentially addresses library agreements on the detailed level of policies and procedures. This type of agreement, as one example, may be suited for libraries that are already part of the same institution and which do not require the Big Picture or the Middle Picture approach. Or, as is the case at UCF, in dealing with the more concrete details of workflow and policies, an agreement having a larger scope may simply refer to more detailed documents outside of the agreement itself that address procedures and work flows of the library. For this "picture," all the decisions already are in place concerning what and how goals are going to be achieved since both libraries fall under the same institutional umbrella. The focus here essentially is on building a cohesive team, and a sense of community between libraries by documenting and clarifying how services are integrated between partners.

It should be recognized also, that information which is too detailed or may change rapidly may not belong in an institutional agreement. Furthermore, the two partners may have different procedures needed or already in place for their respective clientele. These need to be coordinated between organizations. A good example is found in acquisitions departments. There really

needs to be an understanding of which technical services operation does what, and why, and how services can be delivered most cost-effectively. Instructions for staff in the two partner libraries should identify the different stages of the process. In the case of two partner libraries purchasing unique titles, the actual methods for accomplishing this should be clearly defined, and may include, among other things, how items actually are integrated into the collection. Be aware that if a joint-use library is actually one facility, perhaps one set of procedures will do. If the partnership is more of a joint-use service, the partners' procedures must be constructed so that they can be carried out effectively given space and personnel limitations.

While there may be other ways to understand various types of library agreements, distinguishing the three types of library agreements at UCF has been helpful in recognizing the different needs of the unique partnerships needed to provide library services to the students, faculty and staff of our very diverse institution. Library agreements, though, are not enough to ensure an effective and comprehensive delivery of services.

Building a Sense of Community

Regardless of how carefully and thoroughly the written agreements are constructed, it is not solely those agreements that ensure the success of collaborations. It takes a committed, supported and enthusiastic team of library employees. Successful partnerships build on and exemplify the service ethic that librarians uphold and value.[13] In building a collaborative community, the qualities and abilities of persons administering the agreement are crucially important. At UCF, these needed qualities and abilities include: communication, supportive leadership, orientation and training, and a strategic integration of networking technologies.

Communication

Communication is an important factor in how librarians accomplish necessary decision-making and integration of work and service in a partnership environment. A study has shown that twice as many branch librarians (compared to librarians at a central library) indicated that they frequently feel isolated. To help overcome any real or perceived isolation and to build strong partnerships, it is critical to build a sense of community between regional and main campus librarians.[14] A key to accomplishing this is communication, as noted in a Mississippi partnership where a university and a college library collaborated on services[15]. One common and effective way at UCF to invite and create needed communication has been committee involvement of one type or another. For the UCF regional campus librarians especially, participating in committees has been an effective way to establish relationships with colleagues from other regional campuses as well as the main campus. Being able to voice ideas, thoughts, and concerns during the decision-making processes has helped librarians feel they are part of the organization, despite the geographic challenges.

Another effective vehicle for strengthening communication has been active outreach. UCF staff members participate in both academic and social events hosted by partner institutions. Their outreach efforts have both promoted mutual understanding between the UCF libraries and the community college libraries and have served as the catalyst for achieving our common goal – to serve all the users in the best way possible, no matter with which institution they are affiliated.

Supportive leadership

The leadership team of the partner libraries, of course, must be committed to fostering a sense of community among their staff. Strategies at UCF that effectively demonstrate leadership support include frequent visits by UCF library administrators to the partner libraries at which time conversations specifically about local needs of the remote campuses are initiated. Listening carefully and responding meaningfully to the issues and concerns helps greatly to strengthen our partnerships. Staff members at the main library also have a voice that is heard by the leadership team. As needs arise, the library leaders at UCF facilitate further meetings between members of the staff and between the leaders and individual staff members in order to address and resolve matters pertaining to the delivery of service outlined in the partnership agreements.

Support by the leaders in each library within the partnership can be shown in other ways. For example, agreements made at the institutional level might not have anticipated additional funding that may be needed by a community college library partner. For many of the institutions with whom UCF has a partnership agreement, the common arrangement is for librarians to be accustomed to serving primarily the clients of the parent organization usually the college students. When UCF enters into a partnership with a college, strong mutual support developed by the leadership teams of both the college and UCF, helps librarians acclimate to serving a broader population. In one case, when the partnership started, there were relatively few UCF students on that campus. Initially it was agreed at the parent, inter-institutional level that the community college librarian would serve the UCF students. Then as the enrollment of university students at this regional campus grew, there came a point at which appointing a UCF librarian to this joint-use library was justified. A hire was made. Shortly thereafter, one of the college librarians departed, and the UCF librarian at the college campus automatically assumed her service would include all students while the college library staff shortage existed. The point is that a good, collegial, collaborative professional relationship among the library leaders fosters an effective relationship that upholds service and ensures a genuine, effective partnership.

In-depth Orientation and Training

A review of the literature on the topic of staff training suited to multi-campus library services reveals little in-depth description and analysis. While various articles do relate to instruction at distance campuses and for distance students, there is little that deals with the importance, methods and outcomes of orientation and training for staff about the resources and services required for multi-campus libraries.[16] A full treatment of the experience and insights of staff training at UCF could be explored in a subsequent study, but we simply point out here its importance in context of the larger matter of its role in building a sense of community and supporting the formal partnership agreements.

For UCF, a comprehensive orientation and training program for the regional campus librarians was highly desirable, especially for new personnel. The fact that the regional campus librarians are working at joint-use libraries located on campuses of partner institutions often makes it difficult for a new employee to develop a sense of belonging to the home institution. To ameliorate this, an orientation and training program would include the following: meeting with different department heads; job-shadowing other regional campus librarians in departments where the incumbent will conduct similar duties at the assigned campus; meeting with library staff at libraries other than the one assigned to the new librarian. Not only do these activities help ensure librarians are familiar with the policies, procedures and technologies adopted at the libraries within the partnership, it helps librarians get to know the staff and other librarians with whom they work. When library resources are expended for in-depth orientation and training, the equally important message is sent that the institution truly is invested in the success of the partnership.

Strategic Integration of Technology

Capitalizing on new Web 2.0 technologies, UCF implemented several applications to support and enhance the sense of communi-

ty among librarians. While extensive guides to applications of Web 2.0 technologies in libraries abound,[17] and rather than discuss related but peripheral issues, such as resistance to new technologies, technical problems faced and overcome, training required, and how Web 2.0 compares with analog solutions, we simply identify here the uses found at UCF for this technology that support team-building.

First, at UCF we needed an openness to assess and adopt new technology. As the Bottorf article notes (citied in the section on "communication"), some librarians within multi-campus institutions tend to rely primarily upon traditional methods of communication, such as email, phone, and in-person visits.[18] For UCF, however, it was suggested that librarians working in our multi-campus environment should use new technology to improve channels of communication and opportunities for collaboration. The basic uses of new technology for these purposes among UCF regional campus librarians are summarized in the following table:

Table 2 – Use of Technology

Name of Technology	Uses
Google Docs	Facilitate efficient file sharing. Examples of files include collection development order spreadsheets and librarian reference desk schedules and library instruction statistics.
Meebo	Extend IM reference platform across campuses; provide virtual librarian presence to campuses not having UCF librarians.
Wiki	Function as a centralized hub of information for regional campus librarians.
WebCT/WebCourse	Embed regional campus librarians in WebCT/WebCourse classes across campuses.
Polycom/Adobe Connect	Supplement in-person meetings.

Other Web 2.0 technologies may be considered in the future, such as blogs, twitter, MySpace, Facebook, and other social networking tools. The point is that in the interest of building a sense of community it can be helpful to exploit new and creative technologies.

Measures of Success

Every organization has its own culture and style. Some may be operating with a philosophy of total quality management, or a balanced scorecard, or Six Sigma. Whatever theory is in use at the time, there needs to be some way to measure the success of the organization. Management experts have created many elaborate schemes for identifying and measuring success, but in the end success always needs to be measured in reference to the goals of the organization or organizations. In partnership libraries, besides the goal of satisfying patron needs, a likely goal is to nurture and strengthen the partnership itself. At UCF, our measures of success fall into three very broad categories: mutual goals; service enhancements and innovations; and growth. It is recognized that these measures of success are very limited and suited rather narrowly for our purposes, and a broader evaluation could include such matters as the appropriateness of the goals themselves, data showing how patrons and other staff regard the collaborative arrangements and how they might be improved, and data analysis that demonstrate the effectiveness of service enhancements.

Mutual Goals

As mentioned earlier, using technology to improve communication and collaboration among both teaching faculty and partners is a goal in which the UCF librarians continue to show progress. Although the use of a wiki to share and organize information seemed like a good idea at the time, it did not prove to be as workable as the Google Documents interface. Regardless of the format, there is now a place where librarians at distant locations can share information on acquisitions, schedules, and other projects. By adopting teleconferencing technology, the group was able to work through and refine a collection development policy without physically traveling to a central location. With the large number of service locations, there is always some new challenge to work through. Solving partner problems of access, technology, and patron service seem to get easier with experience. Documenting and championing procedures that are successful in one location sometimes shortens the path to successful solutions elsewhere. As another indication of success, UCF librarians now regularly refer to local goals as a way to identify and advocate for new services and also to obtain support for their implementation. This was the case at one of our campuses where an experiment in holding library hours in computer labs was developed and when ultimately this service goal was achieved through consultation with other librarians at other campus libraries.

Service Enhancements and Innovations

Libraries can measure success qualitatively by determining whether or not tangible service enhancements or technological innovations have been adopted. Again, enhancements and innovations achieved at UCF have been a result, one way or another, of collaboration. For example, instant messaging between local librarians and patrons who are not physically present has helped to personalize services for distance and regional students. As another example, in 2008 the regional campus librarians worked as a group to critique and update Web pages as a special project (though, it should be noted, informally our Web presence is always under scrutiny by both users and librarians.) As a collaborative initiative with another academic unit, one campus has been involved in a local grant-funded project to locate and support a writing center within the library. Future goals in this area of service enhancement include continuing to support the campus initiative on information literacy and conducting user surveys on possible other service innovations.

Growth

This measure of success pertains mainly to quantitative results. For UCF librarians, being embedded in an online class was an innovation adopted in 2001. Over the years, the number of University online classes having regional campus librarians embedded has grown from four online classes during the academic year 2001-2002 to 55 classes during 2007-2008. Success of the university-community college partnership concept is also evidenced by the number of new joint-use buildings under construction. One joint-use public/academic library building is scheduled to open in fall 2009 while a second partnership classroom and library building is scheduled for occupancy in spring 2010. These types of measured growth, along with the increasing enrollment figures noted earlier, indicate that the DirectConnect program is meeting the needs of students in Central Florida. They also demonstrate that the UCF librarians are vitally important partners who work together with each other and with other units of the University to effect increased growth for the whole University.

Conclusion

It is reported that state-funded institutions (and the libraries of these institutions) are facing dramatic budget reductions: 65 percent of schools took mid-year budget cuts in 2009. Virtually all state institutions are facing some combination of hiring, salary, sabbatical, pension, travel freezes, and/or firings.[19] UCF is no exception, and we appreciate the imperative to make the most of the resources available. The private institutions are not spared either.[20] In a time of stringent budgets, how can librarians make better use of limited resources to better serve their users? UCF's partnership approach to the library services for its many regional campuses demonstrates that collaborative work proves to be one answer to this question.

It is hoped that our experience can be helpful to other libraries exploring partnerships in the interest of enhancing resources and services in financially difficult times. It is also hoped that our experience at UCF can be a source of encouragement and inspiration for libraries of all types interested in collaborating in more formal ways. While there remain many challenges in operating joint-use libraries not addressed in this paper, the principle of collaboration worked out in formal inter- and intra-library agreements, the creation of a culture of collaboration, and employing appropriate measures of success have raised library services at UCF to new levels. The concept of collaboration for library services at multi-campus institutions requires both new ways of thinking and sometimes radical changes to traditional working practices, but with a supportive leadership and staff who are committed to—and enthusiastic about—collaboration, it is possible to ensure the success of joint-use libraries.

End Notes

[1] Secretary's Procedures and Criteria for the Recognition of Accrediting Agencies, 34. *Code of Federal Regulations* 602.2 (1999).

[2] Tina M. Schneider, "The Regional Campus Library and Service to the Public" *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 27/2 (2001): 122.

[3] J. R. Seymour, "Joint-Use and Partnership Libraries Resources" http://wiki.jrcmor.com/Joint%20Use%20-%20Partnership%20Libraries%20Resources

[4] See, Regional Campus Libraries Discussion Group, "Regional Campus Libraries Literature" http://www.tacoma.washington.edu/library/rcl/rclibsnabcabib.htm

Libraries in other parts of the world outside North American undoubtedly have considerable experience in providing services to multi-campus colleges and universities. Those interested in exploring this topic more thoroughly should not overlook the contributions librarians from these areas have made. For example, the University of South Africa operates an enormously complex li-

brary system covering vast regions. See also, Adrian Swanepoel, "Library Mergers in Higher Education Institutions: Different Theories, Beliefs and Practices" *Sabinet* 22/1 (2004): 1-14.

5 Thomas D. Snyder, Sally A. Dillow and Charlene M. Hoffman, "Digest of Education Statistics 2008 (NCES 2009-020)", National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009020.pdf

6 For a full profile of the University and its libraries, see: http://www.ucf.edu as well as: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/University_of_Central_Florida

7 "Facts at a Glance", Office of Institutional Research, University of Central Florida, 2009. http://www.iroffice.ucf.edu/character/current.html

8 Sarah McNicol, *Joint-Use Libraries: Libraries of the Future* (Oxford: Chandos Publishing, 2008); Ken Haycock, "Dual Use Libraries: Guidelines for Success" *Library Trends* 54/4 (2006): 488-500; Susan Anderson, "Planning for the Future: Combining a Community and College Library" *Library Administration and Management* 13/1 (1999): 81-86; Peggy Conway, "One Reference for Everyone?" *Library Journal* 125/12 (2000): 42-4; Charles Kratz, "Transforming the Delivery of Service: the Joint-use Library and Information Commons" *College & Research Libraries News* 64/2 (2003): 100-101; Donald Riggs, "Joint-use Libraries: Thinking Out of the Box" *College & Research Libraries* 61/2 (2000): 96-97.

9 Karen Dornseif and Ken Draves, "The Joint-Use Library: the Ultimate Collaboration" *Colorado Libraries* 29/1 (2003): 5-7; Patricia T. Bauer, "Changing Places: Personnel Issues of a Joint-Use Library in Transition" *Library Trends* 54/4 (2006): 581-595.

10 Kristen L. Marie, "One Plus One Equals Three: Joint-Use Libraries in Urban Areas—the Ultimate Form of Library Cooperation"

Library Administration & Management 21/1 (2007): 23-28.

11 Andrew D. Scrimgeour and Susan Potter, "The Tie that Binds: the Role and Evolution of Contracts in Interlibrary Cooperation" in *The Fifth Off-campus Library Services Conference Proceedings*, ed. Carol J. Jacob (Mount Pleasant, MI: Central Michigan University Press, 1991), ERIC Document, ED 354 890.

12 Alan Bundy and Larry Amey, "Libraries Like No Others: Evaluating the Performance and Progress of Joint Use Libraries" *Library Trends* 54/4 (2006): 501-518. While assessment is a topic quite different from the creation and purpose of different types of library agreements, among other things, the agreement can be used as a guide and inventory of the issues that should be assessed by both parties. Time-frames specified in an agreement also are good references to timing for assessments since agreements generally have identified renewal or expiration dates.

13 The first statement of the American Library Association's Code of Ethics reads, "We provide the highest level of service to all library users through appropriate and usefully organized resources; equitable service policies; equitable access; and accurate, unbiased, and courteous responses to all requests." See: http://www.ala.org/ala/aboutala/offices/oif/statementspols/codeofethics/codeethics.cfm

14 Tim Bottorf, et al., "Branching Out: Communication and Collaboration Among Librarians at Multi-Campus Institutions" *Journal of Library Administration* 48/3-4 (2008): 329-393.

15 M. Thomas, "Library Services for a Branch Campus: a Partnership Between Mississippi State University-Meridian Branch and Meridian Community College" *Community & Junior College Libraries* 12/4 (2004): 59-64.

16 For studies on the orientation and training for students at distance campuses, see: Susan J. Clayton, Ed., *Going the Distance: Library Instruction for Remote Learners*. (New

York: Neal-Schuman, 2007); Jon R. Hufford, "User Instruction for Distance Students: Texas Tech University System's Main Campus Reaches Out to Students at Satellite Campuses" *Journal of Library Administration* 41/1-2 (2004): 153-165; N. P. Pandya, "Reaching Out to Off-Campus Students via Blackboard TM: A Consortial Library's Experience. *Electronic Journal of Academic and Special Librarianship* 8/2 (2007). http://southernlibrarianship.icaap.org/content/v08n02/pandya_n01.html

[17] See: Stephen Abram, "Web 2.0. Library 2.0 and Librarian 2.0: Preparing for the 2.0 World" an online publication of the *Online Information 2007 Proceedings*. http://www.online-information.co.uk/online09/files/freedownloads.new_link1.1080622103251.pdf and Michael Stephens and Maria Collins, "Web 2.0, Library 2.0 and the Hyperlinked Library" *Serials Review* 33/4 (2007): 253-256. The Abram article sets the stage very well for libraries rethinking operations in terms of Web 2.0 technologies while the Stephens and Collins article gives a more in-depth explanation of various applications and links to relevant sites.

[18] Tim Bottorf, et al.

[19] Kathryn Deiss and Mary Jane Petrowski, "ACRL 2009 Strategic Thinking Guide for Academic Librarians in the New Economy," Association of College & Research Libraries, 2009.

[20] Norman Oder, ARL Budget Roundup: Large Academic Libraries Face Cuts in Collections, Staff, Hours" *Library Journal* (April 30, 2009). http://www.libraryjournal.com/article/CA6655234.html As an indication of the crisis facing even the wealthier institutions, Yale University Library, $4.6 million must be cut from its budget, thirty-five positions will be left unfilled, and travel costs will be cut by 50 percent. The Cornell University Library will cut about 7.1 percent, or about $944,000 from the materials budget funded by endowment payouts.