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Developing a Vital Research Library Workforce

Mark A. Puente, Director of Diversity Programs, ARL

In a recent report entitled “The Once and Future Library,” based on a study commissioned by the Herman Miller corporation, researchers present a view of the future academic library that includes dramatic transformations of roles librarians will be playing in the future—from the “keepers of the flammable inventory” to the role of knowledge navigator, presiding over spaces and services that are increasingly collaborative, complex, and dynamic.¹

The full impact of the recent economic downturn will not be fully understood for some time, however, it is clear that it has accelerated the assessment of workflows, personnel structures, acquisitions priorities, and every other facet of the workings of research libraries today. Anecdotal evidence tells us that libraries and information centers are reorganizing, outsourcing, consolidating service points, weeding collections, and making any other adjustments necessary to telegraph the flexibility of the organization and the willingness to implement new strategies for provision of services relevant to the modern research enterprise.

What remain to be seen are the long-term implications for the research library workforce in terms of the staffing needs and anticipated competencies for library and information professionals of the future. These competencies include subject-domain expertise and functional and/or sociopolitical acumen that will be needed as organizations continue to evolve in response to continued economic pressures, changing pedagogical strategies, and rapid evolutions in the way researchers today search for, consume, and, in some instances, create knowledge. In a broader social context, complexity increases when dealing with the question of best practices for creating services that are best suited for researchers who are “next-gen,” “digital natives,” or other appropriate synonyms. Throw in the added layer of shifting demographics
in the higher education community and you have a perfect storm for confusion and lack of consensus about what the future research library workforce should or will look like.

Paraphrasing from the aforementioned Herman Miller report:

“The diversity of ethnicities, experiences, ages, income, … and expectations of [researchers] create opportunities for libraries to be equally diverse in their management of spaces, delivery of services, [and composition of personnel.]”

Therefore, the research library of today must task itself with developing a workforce with the skills and competencies to further the mission of the institution, whether serving an academic community or public constituency. The library must develop this vital workforce in anticipation of evolving research practice of users in traditional and emerging domains of scholarly inquiry, rapidly changing behavior in seeking and evaluating information, and the growing diversity inherent in the learning communities they serve. These changing needs create a new imperative for recruiting and retaining a research library workforce that will be effective in this dynamic research environment. Moreover, the research library workforce of the future will have to be adept at creating and fostering collaborations with entities within and outside of their institutions due to sustained budgetary pressures and in order to signal to higher level administration that libraries can remain relevant in the age of Google, Wikipedia, and Flickr.

What are then, some of the considerations in this new imperative? What are the skill sets that will be needed to ensure that 21st-century libraries begin to or continue to evolve and properly support the needs of 21st-century researchers? How do libraries frame conversations on this topic during a time of continued economic volatility and stresses to provide more and better with less and fewer? Offered here are several suggestions for this new imperative, suggestions for establishing some priorities for recruitment, and brief commentary on the broad implications for research-intensive organizations.
New Imperatives for Developing a Vital 21st-Century Research Library Workforce

We must develop a vital research library workforce able to provide quality services to growing multicultural, multinational student and faculty constituencies.

With the exception of a precipitous decline in international student enrollment following the events of September 11, 2001, enrollment of international students in higher education continues to increase. In 2008–2009, the Institute of International Education reported that the universities with the top 20 enrollments of international students were campuses served by ARL member libraries. Representation of racial and ethnic minorities in higher education, as well, is undergoing a steady transformation. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), representation of ethnic and racial minorities in higher education is expected to grow at a rate far surpassing their non-Hispanic, white counterparts. According to projections, in the period from 2007 to 2018, enrollment of Hispanics/Latinos in institutions of higher learning will increase by 38%; the projections are 32% for American Indian/Alaska natives, 29% for Asian/Pacific Islanders, and 26% for African Americans or blacks. This reality calls for research libraries to consider the implications for library collections and services of this changing demographic profile in the academy. It is incumbent upon the research library community to anticipate staffing needs in response to these demographic changes, reaching beyond simple representation of the library workforce, and assessing cultural competencies and language fluencies necessary for maintaining and improving customer service.

We must develop a vital research library workforce equipped to deal with research needs of faculty, graduates, and undergraduates working in subject domains and collections with increasingly global orientations.

The development of the Internet and improved access to national and global resources (both in traditional print formats and realia, as well as primary source materials available in digital formats) is paving the way for increased collaboration between teachers and researchers on intra- and international scales. Ease of access provided by technological advances, often facilitated by research libraries, is helping to bring researchers together even in synchronous
collaborations never before thought possible. This global orientation is encouraging the development of international scholarly inquiry that needs the support of information and data managers to navigate effectively through the changing landscape. In addition, with a growing emphasis on special and unique collections, particularly in the humanities and arts, one would posit that the acquisition, curation, and dissemination of said materials would require cross-cultural competencies and language skills that will ensure the appropriate management of these collections or their digital surrogates. Library and information professionals will be needed with appropriate subject domain expertise as well as technical skills to facilitate global collaborations and to organize the resources, data, and content they generate.

**We must develop a vital research library workforce ready to enthusiastically provide support for collaborative learning and research content creation, even on the undergraduate level.**

As more and more resources become available via the Word Wide Web, and research libraries deploy solutions (such as high-density storage) that free up physical space, institutions are retooling facilities to create learning environments that support collaborative study and expanded library services, and that essentially respond to changing pedagogies in higher education. The modern research library workforce must be equipped with expertise to support these changing approaches to teaching and learning, and to assist in the creation of multimedia or data-rich research projects that are increasingly part of the educational enterprise. The mention of undergraduates in this imperative is appropriate since high-level research output has, traditionally, been seen as the domain of graduate students and faculty, but that is no longer the case. This approach begs an assessment of the skills and competencies being taught in the current master of library and information science (MLIS) curriculum. Technical skills in multimedia production software, data-literacy competencies, or fluency with metadata schema and standards will remain important in the modern research library workforce. Equally important, however, may be the ability to envision, create, and manage spaces for experiential learning exercises, encourage experimentation and creativity in collaborative projects, or many other social or soft skills—knowledge that may or may not be reflected in MLIS curricula.
We must develop a research library workforce that is wholly collaborative—building and contributing to library, campus, regional, national, and international partnerships and projects. What has become part of the formula in job descriptions today is the ability for library and information professionals to adapt to change and adjust priorities in dynamic professional environments. This has never been truer as libraries work to leverage resources and build partnerships with outside organizations in areas such as collection management, cataloging and metadata, e-research, and large-scale digitization. Within the institution, what is certainly needed is a workforce with the subject expertise to engage with faculty and researchers in critical data-management programs that include born-digital materials (images, datasets, media) and in emerging subject disciplines.

Similarly, the models for liaison responsibilities in academic institutions are being redefined and developed, shaped by factors such as the need to be more fully engaged with instructional faculty in processes to determine priorities for collection development; the need to be proactive in the determination of desired learning outcomes in information and data-literacy exercises, etc. It is clear that the future workforce will need to continue to evaluate those roles and build effective collaborations that enhance the teaching and research priorities of the constituencies they serve.

Conclusion

These imperatives are but a few of the considerations in developing a vital research library workforce. If the modern library is to serve as the laboratory for supporting dynamic, interactive, and sometimes experimental information consumption and creation, then the library workforce of the future will need to have a diverse range of skills, aptitudes, competencies, and soft skills to support those teaching and learning methodologies. Moreover, the need has never been greater for library and information professionals to embody a collaborative orientation as they engage in dialogue about the information needs of their constituencies and as they think creatively about ways to embed themselves in the research process. So much more could be said about specific areas of expertise needed to contribute to research and education, including knowledge of scholarly publishing, intellectual property rights, web development and database building, and myriad other technical competencies.

Perhaps it is time to re-think the approaches for recruitment into the
profession and to have conversations about the educational and professional requirements that will ensure the development of a workforce best suited to meet the needs of this rapidly changing research enterprise. A logical place to begin these discussions is with researchers—professors, students, and other scholars in research institutions—who, presumably, know better than anyone about needs that are not being met and about projections for how their disciplines are evolving with regard to the changing information needs and learning models being used in higher education.

2 Ibid., 3.

As a beginning point to look at the changing roles of academic librarians, a brief scan of library websites uncovers a dizzying array of titles assigned to library professionals. Just take a look at a few of the titles of librarian positions in academic libraries these days: Repository Architecture Specialist, Bioinformationist, Intellectual Property Officer, Digital User Experience Librarian, Metadata Harvesting Librarian, Global Health Librarian, Curriculum Integration Librarian, Digital Research and Scholarship Librarian, Outreach Librarian, Interface and User Testing Librarian, Instructional Design Librarian, Chief Technology Strategist, Translational Science Information Specialist, and the list goes on.

One might ask if these new titles have confused our users or even librarians themselves. Perhaps. But, does the typical faculty member or student even know our titles. The answer I am quite sure is, “no.” Why should they care what librarians are calling themselves? They do care about what we are doing for and, perhaps more importantly, with them.

The point is not what we call ourselves. I’ll grant you an argument could be made that some of these new titles may intrigue our colleagues on campus and may even garner new respect. And, I’m the first to admit I like some of the new titles and some degree of re-branding for librarians may be desirable. It matters less what we call librarians and matters more that we have confidence that what we offer is valued and that the roles we play are in sync with and critical to the mission of our university.

The “Transforming Research Libraries” section of the ARL Strategic Plan of
2010–2012 speaks of “new and expanding roles for ARL libraries that support, enable, and enrich the transformations affecting research and research-intensive education.”1 Several of the strategies in this segment of the ARL Strategic Plan specifically address the roles of librarians in support of their institutions and research:

**Strategy 4:** Work with the scholarly community and societies to develop discipline-specific strategies for monitoring and analyzing trends in research practices. Identify opportunities for library/scholar partnerships and clarify the resource and service implications of libraries adopting new roles in advancing research.

**Strategy 5:** Promote and facilitate the development of a diverse group of library professionals who have the expertise and knowledge to lead and participate in new partnerships with researchers and university faculty.2

I think these are strategies that most academic librarians wholeheartedly embrace, as I will discuss later in this article. Before I get to that, I want to take a bit of a departure, which I hope you will find relevant.

**Academic Libraries as “Pull” Organizations**

I recently read the book, The Power of Pull, by John Hagel III, John Seely Brown, and Lang Davison, and noted many concepts within it that could help us as we think about transforming roles for academic librarians. At several junctures, Hagel et al. reference the “super node” as “someone who bridges groups of people who might not otherwise be aware of each other” and who is especially skilled at connecting ideas and people.3 If that doesn’t describe librarians, what does? We are and always will be “super nodes”! Librarians have a distinct and one might even say, unique, vantage point on campus, working with faculty, researchers, IT colleagues, and others from a diverse array of disciplines and areas of expertise. And, the very essence of our profession has been to help make critical connections, particularly between ideas and people. Now, we must take that role even further.

If you’ll bear with me, I’ll take a few more concepts from The Power of Pull...
and put them in the context of the academic library world. This book is based on the premise that we need to move away from a world of “push” and to a world of “pull.” The world of “push,” as defined by Hagel et al. is predicated on forecasting needs and then designing the most efficient systems to ensure the right people and resources are available at the right time and the right place, often using scripted and standardized processes. Further, the world of “push” focuses on “stocks of knowledge” and “explicit knowledge.” Does all of this sound familiar? It should, because academic libraries in many ways have been classic examples of “push” organizations. I hope to demonstrate that academic librarians are also, no doubt unbeknownst to us, early adopters of many of the “pull” concepts (more on this later).

First, some ask why we need to change. Why do we need to move away from “push” to “pull”? Hagel et al. say, “The world is transforming around you. The truth is, the things you did to get there will no longer work to keep you there.” They continue, “We no longer live in the industrial economy of the 1950s, or even that of the 1970s. And the techniques we used to master those worlds are no longer effective.”

The simplest things in our everyday lives have changed—from hunting up old classmates on Facebook to looking for a hotel room for our family vacation—using a variety of online tools to seek reviews, directions, best price, the quality of the bed linens, etc. As librarians we certainly know the way people look for information and how they approach research has changed dramatically. This most certainly is just the beginning of changes we cannot begin to predict.

Two of the three primary levels of “pull” described by Hagel et al. are particularly applicable to academic librarians:

At the most basic level, pull helps us to find and access people and resources when we need them. At a second level, pull is the ability to attract people and resources to you that are relevant and valuable, even if you were not aware before that they existed. Think here of serendipity rather than search.

I can think of many librarian positions that already operate very effectively in a world of “pull.” Long known for providing access to information and resources, librarians have gone further with positions such as metadata librarians, digital user experience librarians, and curriculum integration librarians. Librarians in these roles dramatically improve access to library
resources, services, and even librarians whenever the patron needs them by integrating library information and services with campus course management systems and administrative portals. Typically a digital user experience librarian might oversee the web-publishing infrastructure and integrate discovery tools for electronic resources. They implement transformative technologies to improve access and they employ user testing and redesign to gauge and improve the success of these technologies. Metadata specialists have studied and utilized emerging technologies to improve access to objects in the digital library systems.

As mentioned above, the second level of “pull” is the ability to attract, increasing the probability of serendipitous encounters, thereby drawing new people, information, and ideas to you. Here is where I think of embedded librarians or field librarians and their success in this arena. As my colleague, Laurie Alexander, and I described what distinguishes a field librarian at the University of Michigan from a departmental librarian, we said:

As faculty and students walk through the doors into a departmental library, the nature of their communication changes. Their encounters with librarians are more purposeful, and the communication is more formal. When a librarian’s office is located in the library, he/she tends to be associated with the collection and a set of rules and policies wrapped around the use of the collection and that physical space. This association changes when the librarian’s office is located in the department, which enables the faculty member to pop his/her head into the field librarian’s office. A very different dynamic develops (or exists) when a faculty member runs into a field librarian while sipping coffee in the lounge rather than in the formal setting of a library. This shared and familiar environment creates an atmosphere of comfort and builds the foundation for a solid working relationship. Perhaps even more than originally anticipated, the field librarians have built strong relationships with faculty by embedding themselves into their communities and thereby, the scholarly activities of the faculty.

A good example of the power of serendipity is when the classical studies field librarian learned through a casual hallway conversation that a graduate student intended to travel to Europe to obtain some Greek manuscripts essential
to his dissertation. Not knowing that the field librarian could purchase digital or microfilm copies of those manuscripts for him, the graduate student simply never thought to ask a librarian for help. The student’s research needs were only uncovered due to a conversation on another matter. This serendipitous encounter saved the delighted graduate student an expensive trip abroad.8

Of course, although there is great value in physical proximity, a virtual presence can be equally important. Another great example of improving the likelihood of serendipitous encounters is an outreach librarian who may be active in social networking sites, enabling librarians and multiple patrons to interact and share dynamically and to learn from one another.

New Roles for Academic Librarians

Perhaps more important to many of you than knowing that academic libraries are forward-looking “pull” organizations, is discussing how we are achieving the strategic directions articulated in the ARL Strategic Plan. In his article, “Accelerating Learning and Discovery: Refining the Role of Academic Librarians,” Andrew Dillon wrote:

The academic library is tied to the academic mission of the university. In contextual terms, we must recognize the shifts in scholarship practices that are occurring in our universities and research labs, and then seek to understand how the library functions appropriately in this new world where large data repositories become the norm for some disciplinary practices; where many students never visit a physical campus, let alone a library; where libraries assume part of the role of publishers; where tenure decisions are loosened from the documentary formats we have known for decades; and where special collections become indistinguishable from museums…. With digital collections becoming boundary objects between academics, librarians, students and designers in a manner that has no obvious historical parallel, the ability to engage in the most fundamental way with the mission of a university will define the importance of academic librarianship in the future.9

I wholeheartedly agree with Dillon and also believe many academic librarians across the country are recognizing the shifts he suggests and are
forging new roles for themselves and other librarians. Their roles have extended well beyond what we would have expected from even our most adventurous and innovative librarians a few short years ago. They are deeply integrated into the research fabric of the university and are engaged in a profound manner with the mission of the university.

The best way I can demonstrate my premise is to give you two examples from my own institution, Indiana University (IU). The first example is Angela Courtney, Head of Arts and Humanities at IU Bloomington, as I share the story of one particular project that richly illustrates how she is (to paraphrase the ARL Strategic Plan) supporting, enabling, and enriching the transformations affecting our university.

The Victorian Women Writers Project (VWWP), an Indiana University digital text project, was last updated in 2003. In its heyday in the late 1990s it was groundbreaking, but it had become dated and needed dedicated work to return this once groundbreaking initiative to its rightful place in the digital library community. At the end of 2008, Angela submitted a successful proposal to expand and enhance the VWWP in three directions: to move beyond British women to include women writing in English regardless of national borders, to broaden genres included, and to span the long 19th century rather than the Victorian era. A major goal of this endeavor was to have the VWWP accepted as part of the Networked Infrastructure for Nineteenth-Century Electronic Scholarship (NINES) and this upgrade was the first step.10

Then Angela took another important step. Angela began what became many extensive conversations with individual faculty members and faculty groups in the English Department and together they agreed to develop a digital humanities class that would incorporate VWWP and text encoding. Angela met with graduate students who were initially interested in restarting this project because they needed a resource where they could find texts that they wanted to use in teaching and research. They agreed that it would be useful to be involved in encoding and developing contextual materials, but they also felt that, in order to justify the time commitment, these activities would have to be connected to a class. After discussions between Angela and the Victorianists on the faculty, they agreed that this is an important endeavor, but that it should really be a new class rather than an added element in a current class. The English Department Head also agreed, and gave the go-ahead for Angela to work with a faculty member to develop a syllabus.
Meanwhile, working with her hourly students and graduate assistant, Angela developed an extensive genre vocabulary that will be used to classify the works included in the VWWP, based on the Modern Language Association International Bibliography genre terms. She wanted to make the database browsable and searchable by genre, and also wanted the genre list to be as detailed as possible, considerably more complex than prose, poetry, and drama.

What was the outcome of Angela’s work? The English Department now recognizes the importance of digital humanities literacy to its graduate students, and there is little doubt this recent shift in thinking is due in large part to Angela’s interactions with the department and to the revitalization of the VWWP. Recently, interested parties in the department created a digital humanities e-mail list and began a digital humanities seminar series, and Angela was included as part of this initiative. The class mentioned above will include readings and discussion of the theoretical underpinnings of the digital humanities as well as practical sessions on advanced scholarly text encoding as set out by the Text Encoding Initiative. Students will encode texts for the VWWP, and they will also create secondary contextualizing materials for texts including introductions, bibliographies, and timelines. Angela will co-teach this class with a faculty member and they describe the class as “a hands-on, practical class squarely aimed at investigating the expanding field of the digital humanities as they impact and intersect with literary studies, with regard to key activities and skills of our scholarly lives, current and future: research, editing, teaching, and professional development.”

The creation of the digital humanities course, the revitalization of the digital text project, and the faculty awareness of the importance of digital literacy for graduate students were all made possible because of Angela’s deep involvement with her colleagues in the English Department. This story illustrates a librarian who has gone beyond the typical subject specialist’s role. She truly collaborated with faculty in course development, teaching, and research.

A second example comes from Carrie Donovan, Head, Teaching, and Learning, at IU Bloomington. Carrie was recently on a team of Indiana University faculty from the departments of sociology, anthropology, art, and astronomy who applied for and won a “Scholarship of Teaching and Learning Leadership” grant for their research regarding the use of visual methods as a learning tool central to teaching disciplinary concepts critical to student success. As part of the project, “How Can Visual Methods Enhance Teaching and
Learning in the General Education Classroom? A Multi-Disciplinary and Collaborative Research Project,” they spent three years investigating student-generated visual projects. In particular, they examined how such products not only help the learning of key disciplinary concepts but also provide valuable evidence of student learning that can be used for assessment purposes. Carrie worked closely with a sociology faculty member to determine best practices for introducing students to the research and information-seeking process through visual methods.

Carrie was part of a team that approached teaching as a process of inquiry that could inform the development and application of new pedagogy. Instead of being involved in only one aspect of a course as she typically had been in the past (e.g., assignment design, library instruction sessions, etc.), she was able to participate in the development of course outcomes, assignments, and assessments, as well as being a part of their implementation. In working alongside faculty to guide student learning and assess student work, she gained insights into discipline-focused thinking and the foundational knowledge that crosses disciplinary boundaries. Having a better understanding of the issues facing teaching faculty has improved her understanding of the current academic environment in terms of the potential for information literacy education and assessment at the course level and curriculum-wide. To quote Carrie, “So, when I think about information literacy now, I am able to see it as a learning initiative, rather than simply a library initiative.”

Carrie’s work represents a great example of a librarian becoming an integral part of the teaching and learning process. But, above all, both of these examples give me great hope that academic libraries are developing “a diverse group of library professionals who have the expertise and knowledge to lead and participate in new partnerships with researchers and university faculty.”

2 Ibid., 17.
4 Ibid., 47.
5 Ibid., 32.
6 Ibid., 9.
8 Ibid., 29.

10 NINES is a scholarly organization devoted to forging links between the material archive of the 19th century and the digital research environment of the 21st. For more information, see the NINES website: http://www.nines.org/about/what_is.html.

11 The Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) is a consortium that collectively develops and maintains a standard for the representation of texts in digital form. For more details, see the TEI website: http://www.tei-c.org/index.xml.
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Restructuring at UCLA Library

Gary E. Strong, University Librarian, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA)

At UCLA we call it “academic and administrative restructuring.” It has other names in other places. But the same scenario, with differing dimensions, remains if called something else—higher education and large research universities are strained at the core and those of us who care about and for them are challenged to polish our crystal balls and gaze toward a future that will sustain the values and beliefs that have created our universities. It seems the debate is raging as ARL looks at scenarios for the future,¹ and Ithaka² and other groups are pushing to forecast the future of research libraries.

Dan Greenstein, Vice Provost for Academic Planning and Programs at the University of California, has been widely quoted from remarks made at a forum at Baruch College of the City University of New York. He was reported to have stated, “The university library of the future will be sparsely staffed, highly decentralized, and have a physical plant consisting of little more than special collections and study areas. We’re already starting to see a move on the part of the university libraries…to outsource virtually all the services developed and maintained over the years.”³ This statement has sparked a widespread debate about just how accurate such a forecast is.

UCLA Library does not approach its future with this view in mind. When I arrived at UCLA in 2003, the library was faced with budget reductions that actually took root in 1994 when the state budget faced significant shortfalls in revenue. I was challenged with recovering from a failed integrated library system solution and the closure of the physics library. We worked those difficulties through. Integration of most of the separate technical services units across a diverse campus was already underway. Librarians were defining how we could become more engaged in new directions for undergraduate education, experiment with digital reference, and envision a new “UCLA electronic library.” Over the next two years, we drafted a new strategic plan that resulted
in a process, not a document, which would help us envision our future at UCLA. That plan still provides the foundation from which we are developing new futures for the UCLA Library.

As we think about the future, we have affirmed the overall strategic directions laid out in our strategic plan and have added two more: (1) build and operate a responsible organization, and (2) develop a research agenda for the library. A major impetus for this has been the library’s response to academic and administrative restructuring since we straddle both sides within the UCLA community. As I mentioned, we began consolidation and merger of “behind the scenes” operations in 2002. Technical services functions of acquisitions, serials, and cataloging as well as interlibrary loan were examined. As those plans were implemented, we were able to reduce the number of staff positions that had traditionally supported these functions. We protected the baseline acquisitions budget, and those positions remaining in the consolidated operations were redefined. Anyone who has gone through this experience knows that that is no easy task as work within a unionized environment requires a good deal of consultation and discussion. From that initial process, the Cataloging and Metadata Center was born, which has developed to provide broad-based support for the description of unique holdings, to partner with academic faculty on digital projects to create metadata, and to tackle various backlogs of monographs and serials so they are discoverable by faculty and students.

In 2006 sciences acquisitions was merged into this consolidated operation, in 2008–09 acquisitions for the Management Library was added, and planning is underway for the same in the Music Library. When the head of the Sciences and Engineering Libraries retired, responsibility for oversight of all of the sciences, including the Biomedical Library was centralized under one Associate University Librarian. We took that same approach when the head of the arts and music libraries retired. There were a number of librarian reassignments to fill gaps in various disciplines across campus. New units were created to support licensing and digital content management as well as to establish a full-scale preservation office for the first time in UCLA Library history.

In 2009 five special collections units were combined into a new UCLA Library Special Collections. While collections were not relocated, this allowed for integration of various “behind the scenes operations” as well as public services in order to better support this growing area of concentration. A new department head was on board by March 2010 and is working to address these integration issues.
With our involvement and leadership, the campus has embedded an intellectual property librarian into its implementation of the Common and Collaborative Learning Environment (MOODLE), which ideally will replace some 26 separate and distinct course management systems formerly used by departments and schools. This work and the work of our Scholarly Communication Steering Committee has enhanced the library’s support to faculty and graduate students in managing their own intellectual property and in determining what can be posted on course websites as well as how licensed information is incorporated into course packets produced by the campus bookstore.

These efforts have helped us enhance our support of undergraduate education as it changes at UCLA. As departments mature their undergraduate capstone requirements, the library is called upon to provide access to primary source materials for a significantly enlarged student base. This calls for new directions in instruction and engagement and will increase the demand on our unique resources.

To more adequately support the implementation of the UCLA IT strategic plan and enhance the digital scholarship role that the library plays on the campus, a new Associate University Librarian (AUL) for Digital Initiatives and Information Technology was appointed in April 2010. Four units that previously reported to different AULs and the Deputy University Librarian now combine to form a new direction focused on digital scholarship and other IT initiatives. Three of these units, the Digital Library Program, Web Services, and Library Computing Services, were all created or refocused during the last five years. Now their challenge is to work together in support of the library. The AUL for Digital Initiatives and Information Technology also supports an increased effort to coordinate the library’s information technology programs with those of various units across the broader campus. This new structure will guide us as we begin to work with the campus to address the “data challenge.”

We have worked tirelessly with our broader UC colleagues in collection development, preservation, digital asset management, and resource sharing. UCLA manages one of the regional facilities for our colleagues. We participate broadly in the planning and design of new services, such as those directions recommended by the Bibliographic Services Task Force.

I am occasionally asked what all of this means for the library and for UCLA. “What are your goals?” I generally respond that for me it is all about keeping
UCLA Library within the top 10 research libraries in North America. That supports the chancellor’s goal of sustaining a major public research university. Without a library to support his vision, the disciplines, degrees, colleges, schools, and programs of UCLA will not be able to succeed. So our whole approach at academic and administrative restructuring is focused toward that end.

**Restructuring’s Implications for Library Staffing**

Given this background, what has restructuring meant for staffing and what will library staff look like in the future? We are already seeing some of the realities and have taken steps to address the challenge as we can best define them.

**Define and Recruit Key Leadership Positions**

By tightening senior leadership positions we have moved to bring talent into the library that can guide us into the future. By redefining mid-management positions into positions of leadership we hope to strengthen our contribution to the campus. Traditionally, these positions also managed facilities and staffing; I want them to concentrate more on program and scholarly support. I want librarians to do “library work” not staff security desks or reshelve books, though these are important and necessary tasks. I want librarians who think like our users, both students and faculty, and who can relate to the social technologies and networking that define these audiences. I want librarians who engage with our users to build collections and define our programs. We support their development with training and other tools, many sponsored by ARL and other entities (UCLA Senior Fellows, ARL Research Library Leadership Fellows, Frye Leadership Institute, ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute, etc.).

**Explore Alternative Recruitment Tracks for Academic Appointments**

We aggressively recruit and hire newly minted MLIS students, but this pool is shrinking. Their expertise is one of the best returns on investment that the campus can make. As a participant in the Council on Library and Information Resources (CLIR) Postdoctoral Fellowships in Academic Libraries, we have had new talent coming into the library over the past five years. Some of these fellows move into staff positions; in fact, our new head of Collections, Research, and Instructional Services at the Charles E. Young Research Library is a CLIR post-
doctoral fellow who has cast her lot with us. Another has assumed a challenge as an area studies bibliographer. And another is working in our “Collecting Los Angeles” initiative with indigenous populations in Los Angeles. With each retirement and each resignation, we examine the position and redefine it to meet new and changing needs in supporting UCLA programs.

We are not looking for a “generic” librarian, we seek out librarians who can do reference and instruction and use new social networking technologies in their work. We seek librarians who are strong subject specialists and understand the literature of the disciplines that they will serve. We are challenged to provide librarians who can support teaching and learning but who also understand and support the scope of research done at UCLA. I want librarians who promote the library’s value-add to research through collaboration, breaking down artificial boundaries of the internal organization chart, and going beyond the physical walls of the library and into virtual space to speed messages and images back and forth. We need experts who can connect with researchers and show them what the library can do for them, and then plan with them what we can do together. Our experts then bring back some of these researchers and work with them inside our libraries. Some of our experts are embedded in the departments where the students are.

**Enhance the Career Path for Seasoned and Talented Staff**

As mentioned above, we are rethinking a number of our senior staff positions to assume responsibility for portions that used to be assigned to librarian unit heads—management of facilities, processing of personnel forms, acquiring supplies and outside services, maintaining technology, and handling student employment. UCLA has always had a very talented pool of staff for which this opportunity significantly enhances their development. Again, it is critical that their development be supported with a strong staff development portfolio.

**Embrace the Potential Contributions of Students**

As we restructure, we are increasingly dependent on the talents of the students who study at UCLA. They serve as desk assistants, oversee night and weekend services, and take on tasks beyond reshelving materials. Perhaps the most
promising example of this has been the creation of the Center for Primary Research and Training\(^6\) within Library Special Collections. With more than 100 graduate students who have been engaged in processing previously “hidden” collections since the center’s establishment in 2004, we have a solid track record of the contributions these students can make, and they have also had real experience in working with and handling primary source materials. Increasingly the center engages faculty support and involvement and brings language and subject expertise to the library that we could never employ on a long-term basis. We expect that a number of theses and dissertations will result from what students find and learn while working in the center. I have also funded an initiative within Web Services to bring several graduate students aboard to explore potential library applications of social networking technologies. We are beginning to see the potential of tapping this kind of talent on the campus, and their presence contributes to a better understanding of what students expect from us.

**Conclusion**

We know that we will be different, but I do not define the UCLA Library as “sparsely staffed, highly decentralized, and a physical plant consisting of little more than special collections and study areas.” When we open our renovated space in the Research Library next spring, the research commons will have collaborative space with the Center for Digital Humanities for a cultural heritage laboratory. We will reach out to build new partnerships and collaborations that bring faculty and students into our space to create new knowledge, discover our collections in new ways, and interact with our academic staff librarians as partners in that journey.

My vision for the UCLA Library does not sustain a static organization, but a library that engages and develops. At UC the shared activities that might be managed by the Office of the President in the future should not focus on temporal consolidations of systemwide library space or services. These efforts need to be campus-based and address campus priorities. Our collaboration should strengthen, not diminish, our capacity in meeting the challenges inherent in “restructuring.” This direction is reflected in UCLA Library’s living planning documents and new campus collaborations.

As I finish this paper, the UC system is planning a task force study to “recommend the systemwide strategies and investments that the University
needs to pursue with regard to library services in light of the numerous environment changes....” I am concerned about a charge that speaks to “greater systemwide or regional consolidation of library services and systems” and “use of library space.” Each of our campuses is different; we offer different degrees and focus on differing disciplines; we believe in service to our respective communities. I hope we do not lose that. UCLA is truly unique and interesting as each of us is. We need to be able to flourish in the context of our setting.

Let us be cautious that we are not about to “burn the great library at Alexandria,” only to force future generations to rebuild it in a new era to preserve the record of humankind and the kaleidoscope of human knowledge.

6 See “UCLA Library Department of Special Collections: Center for Primary Research and Training Research Opportunities,” http://www.library.ucla.edu/specialcollections/researchlibrary/9613.cfm.
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Understanding the Organizational Value of Post–Master’s Degree Residency Programs

Julie Brewer, Librarian and Coordinator of Personnel and Staff Development, University of Delaware Library

Post–master’s degree research library residency programs have been in place for many years, primarily in ARL libraries. A number of large research libraries have hosted residency programs for several decades. Accounts of residency programs are most often presented from the residents’ perspectives or discussed in terms of how participants benefit. Many former residents enthusiastically report on their residency experiences at professional conferences and in various publications. It is clear these early-career development opportunities greatly benefit participants.

However, the decline in the economy of the past few years has challenged research libraries to assess how residency programs benefit the organization. How do residency programs further the mission and strategic goals of the library? Providing early-career development may not be enough of a rationale to start or continue a residency program when library budgets are being reduced.

While a few residency programs are funded with endowments, grants, or other private funds, the majority of residency positions are managed as regular salary lines. These positions can be vulnerable even in good budget cycles, since they are temporary, short-term, and vacant at predictable times. Many pressing administrative needs compete for salary resources whenever a position opens. Continued funding depends on how well organizational benefits are understood and communicated. Residency programs require renewed commitment with each recruitment opportunity. As a former resident myself, as well as a residency program coordinator at the University of Delaware Library and as a consultant to residency programs in other research libraries, I have grown increasingly aware of the organizational benefits of residency programs and the importance...
Enhancing Diversity

A primary objective of many residency programs is to increase the racial and ethnic diversity of the library staff, which in turn supports the broader organizational goal of expanding the delivery of library services to increasingly diverse student and faculty populations. Much has been written about how diversity contributes to organizational productivity, decision making, and culture and most research universities include diversity among their core values. Faculty, staff, and student recruitment initiatives are specifically designed to increase campus diversity. Post-master’s residency programs naturally align with library and campus diversity goals.

While residency programs do increase staff diversity, there are additional diversity outcomes that are not as visible. Long-standing residency programs bring value to research libraries beyond changing demographics. They very publicly demonstrate a sustained commitment to diversity over time, as well as organizational adeptness in managing diversity. These are significant indicators of organizational effectiveness that enhance diversity recruitment and retention for positions throughout the library.

Job seekers from underrepresented groups notice library employers that host residency programs. A long-standing residency can be a positive indication of a welcoming environment to prospective employees. Residency programs contribute to diversity retention, as well. Many library staff from underrepresented groups make meaningful contributions to residency programs and take pride in the success of the resident librarians. They are often very attuned to how the program is handled by administrators and valued by colleagues. Current and prospective employees from all backgrounds view the residency program as a measure of the organization’s ability to manage diversity.

Beyond racial and ethnic diversity, residency programs also contribute to career-span diversity within research libraries. The composition of professional staff in large research libraries is typically dominated by mid-career and late-
career librarians. Because research libraries are large, complex organizations with work that is highly specialized, search committees naturally favor candidates with the most technical expertise and years of experience. It is not unusual for search committees to prefer candidates with the most advanced education and greatest record of scholarship to ensure their success through promotion and tenure systems. Although unintentional, these environmental and cultural factors substantially limit employment opportunities for early-career librarians. It is rare to find position announcements in research libraries requiring less than three to five years of professional experience.

Residency programs intentionally remove these institutional employment barriers for early-career librarians. Residency positions are designed for new graduates with no post-master’s professional experience. Many are classified as non-tenure track positions, providing time for residents to acclimate to the higher education environment and build a record of scholarship and professional service “off-the-clock.”

**Organizational Effectiveness**

Research libraries with long-standing residency programs value the unique contributions that early-career librarians bring to the organization. Those just out of graduate school bring an immediate student perspective. Their recent student experience and ability to connect with the library’s primary constituency is invaluable. In addition, they bring enthusiasm and currency with emerging technologies, as well as knowledge of how students and faculty are using or could be using these technologies in their research. Their enthusiasm, their new ideas, and their willingness to experiment contribute to the goals and mission of research libraries.

Career-span diversity also enhances organizational effectiveness through professional and career development. When individuals at different points in their careers work, collaborate, and learn from one another the organization is more dynamic. Senior staff have opportunities to mentor and be recognized for their expertise and experience. Newer staff bring questions, ideas, and energy for change. The professional development interests of both senior and early-career librarians are met when they collaborate in pairs and on teams.

Another organizational benefit is the extension of professional development opportunities originally designed for resident librarians to other staff. Long-standing residency programs often extend mentoring programs, seminars, and
site visits to other continuing staff. Many of the cross-institutional learning and networking opportunities initiated for resident librarians benefit other early-career librarians, as well. Recent examples of collaborative learning and networking opportunities across institutions are the Chesapeake Information and Research Library Alliance (CIRLA) Fellows Program and the regional residency program meeting held at the University of Delaware Library in April 2010. The consideration given to supporting the regular influx of early-career librarians and their professional development sustains a culture of learning for everyone.

Managing Change

The staffing flexibility provided by residency programs also enhances the organization’s ability to manage change. Having a temporary, professional position available every year or two years allows research libraries to experiment with the design and delivery of new services. Residents can fulfill short-term staffing needs before continuing resources are committed. Residents often assist research libraries to explore and adopt emerging technologies. New trends can be investigated with a timeliness that is not possible through more traditional staffing such as requesting a new position or reassigning or retraining existing staff. As a result, residency programs enhance organizational flexibility and the ability of research libraries to manage change.

Residency programs also help to develop frontline managers or specialists in areas that are difficult to recruit, such as the natural and health sciences. Research libraries with long-standing residency programs recognize the value of developing leaders “in-house.” Providing leadership development is especially important as early-career librarians take on management responsibilities. Residency programs are one way research libraries prepare individuals for leadership positions early in their careers. The libraries benefit by tailoring development opportunities to the specific needs of the organization.

Conclusion

After reviewing the organizational impact of some long-standing programs, it is apparent that post-master’s residency programs have broader organizational benefits than may have been initially understood at their implementation. Residency programs that started out years ago as strategies for minority recruitment and early-career development have succeeded in enhancing organizational climate and flexibility. They no longer focus exclusively on how
participants benefit. Instead, they serve as one indicator of organizational effectiveness.

Well-established residencies represent dynamic organizations that value diversity and professional development for all positions. They visibly communicate the nature and priorities of the library’s organizational culture to prospective employees and to the research library community at large. The importance of these organizational benefits is renewed with each residency recruitment cycle.

1 A library residency is a post–master’s degree work-experience program that provides entry-level employment and professional development for early-career librarians. Residencies are short-term professional librarian positions that typically last one to three years. In 1996 the Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE) distinguished post-master’s residency programs from pre-professional internships and mid-career fellowship programs in their “Guidelines for Practices and Principles in the Design, Operation, and Evaluation of Post-Master’s Residency Programs,” published in Library Personnel News 10 (May/June 1996): 1–3.

2 The University of Delaware Library celebrated the 25th anniversary of the Pauline A. Young Residency Program on June 27, 2010 in Washington, DC, at the American Library Association Annual Conference with colleagues from the national research library residency community. There are approximately two dozen active residency programs today. More than 50 academic and research libraries have hosted residency programs for early career librarians at one time or another. ARL has provided tremendous support over the years for residents, residency program coordinators, and the development of new residency programs. The forthcoming book, The New Graduate Experience: Post-MLS Residencies and Early Career Librarianship, co-edited by Megan Zoe Perez and Cindy A. Gruwell, to be published by Libraries Unlimited in January 2011 provides the most current accounts of residency experiences, as well as discussion on managing diversity and early-career development. Additional information about residency programs, including resident profiles, links to current residency programs, news, resources, and collaborative initiatives is available on the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) Residency Interest Group website http://acrl.alaa.org/residency/. For more information about the University of Delaware’s residency program, see “Library Celebrates 25th Anniversary of Pauline A. Young Residency Program,” UDaily, July 6, 2010, http://www.udel.edu/udaily/2011/jul/residency070610.html.
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News

ARL Announces 2010–2011 Board of Directors

Carol A. Mandel, Dean of the Division of Libraries, New York University, began a one-year term as President of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) on October 14, 2010, during the ARL Fall Membership Meeting held in Washington, DC. She succeeds Brinley Franklin, Vice Provost, University Libraries, University of Connecticut. Franklin continues to serve as a member of the ARL Board of Directors and Executive Committee as Past President.

Also on October 14, the membership ratified the Board of Directors’ election of Winston Tabb, Sheridan Director and Dean of University Libraries, Johns Hopkins University, as ARL Vice President/President-Elect.

Three new Board members were elected by the membership to serve three-year terms: Deborah A. Carver, Philip H. Knight Dean of Libraries, University of Oregon; Ernie Ingles, Vice-Provost, University of Alberta; and Anne R. Kenney, Carl A. Kroch University Librarian, Cornell University.

Continuing elected members of the Board are: Colleen Cook, Dean of University Libraries, Holder of the Sterling C. Evans Chair in Librarianship, Texas A&M University; Carol Pitts Diedrichs, Director, University Libraries, Ohio State University; Deborah Jakubs, Rita DiGiallonardo Holloway University Librarian, Vice Provost for Library Affairs, Duke University; Wendy Pradt Lougee, University Librarian, McKnight Presidential Professor, University of Minnesota; James Mullins, Dean of Libraries, Purdue University; and Sandra G. Yee, Dean, University Library System, Wayne State University.

Also serving on the Board in ex officio capacities are: Carole Moore, Chief Librarian, University of Toronto; Carton Rogers, Vice Provost and Director of Libraries, University of Pennsylvania; James F. Williams II, Dean of Libraries University of Colorado at Boulder; and Charles B. Lowry, Executive Director, ARL.

The Board is the governing body of the Association and represents the interests of ARL member libraries in directing the business of the Association, including establishing operating policies, budgets, and fiscal control and representing ARL to the community.
**ARL Transitions**

**McGill:** Colleen Cook has been appointed Trenholme Dean of Libraries, effective January 2011. She is currently Dean of University Libraries at Texas A&M.

**Virginia Tech:** Eileen Hitchingham announced her intention to retire from her position of Dean of University Libraries, effective February 1, 2011.

**Other ARL Appointments**

**National Museum and Library Services (NMLS) Board:** On October 18, 2010, Winston Tabb (Johns Hopkins) was sworn in to serve on the NMLS Board, which advises the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) on policy and practices.

**ARL Staff Transitions**

**Shaneka Morris** was appointed Statistics Editorial Assistant, effective September 1, 2010. She recently earned her MSLS from the University of North Texas and was a 2008–10 ARL Diversity Scholar.

**Kristen Riccard** was named ARL Law and Policy Fellow, effective September 7, 2010. Her one-year assignment at ARL to work on public policy matters is being supported by the Washington DC law firm Ropes & Gray.

**Other Transitions**

**Association of American Universities (AAU):** Robert M. Berdahl announced that he will retire from his position of AAU President, effective May 1, 2011, when his current contract expires.

**Association of Public and Land-grant Universities (APLU):** R. Michael Tanner, Provost at the University of Illinois at Chicago, has been appointed Chief Academic Officer and Vice President of APLU, effective January 10, 2011. Tanner will replace David Shulenburger, who retires December 31, 2010.

**Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS):** President Obama announced his intention to nominate Susan H. Hildreth as IMLS Director. She is currently the City Librarian of the Seattle Public Library and was previously appointed as California’s State Librarian by Governor Schwarzenegger.
National Science Foundation (NSF): The US Senate approved President Obama’s nomination of Subra Suresh, Dean of the MIT School of Engineering, to serve as the next Director of NSF for a six-year term.

Society of College, National, and University Libraries (SCONUL UK): Ann Rossiter was appointed Executive Director, effective September 13, 2010. She was previously a special adviser in government, where her work included higher education and intellectual property policy.

Honors

David H. Carlson (Southern Illinois Carbondale) has been named the 2010 Illinois Academic Librarian of the Year by the Illinois Library Association. The award is presented by the Illinois Association of College and Research Libraries (IACRL) Forum in recognition of outstanding contributions to academic and research librarianship in the state.

Virginia: On October 28, 2010, the US Government Printing Office’s (GPO) Acting Superintendent of Documents Ric Davis honored the University of Virginia Alderman Library for a century of providing Americans free and public access to the documents of our democracy. For 100 years, Alderman Library has been a member of GPO’s Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 3–6</td>
<td>XML Development: From Markup to Application</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7</td>
<td>ARL Library Assessment Forum</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 7</td>
<td>ARL Survey Coordinators &amp; SPEC Liaisons Meeting</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 8–9</td>
<td>ARL Leadership Symposium</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10</td>
<td>LibQUAL+® Training Sessions</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 10–14</td>
<td>METS Workshop: The Basics and Beyond</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 10–11</td>
<td>ARL Board Meeting</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 14–18</td>
<td>Service Quality Evaluation Academy</td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4–5</td>
<td>CNI Spring Membership Meeting</td>
<td>San Diego, California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3–6</td>
<td><strong>ARL Board &amp; Membership Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Montreal, Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 25–26</td>
<td>ARL Board Meeting</td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11–14</td>
<td><strong>ARL Board &amp; Membership Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Washington, DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 12–13</td>
<td>CNI Fall Membership Meeting</td>
<td>Arlington, Virginia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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