



## **SURVEY RESULTS**



---

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

### Introduction

Talent management is defined as “an integrated set of processes, programs, and cultural norms in an organization designed and implemented to attract, develop, deploy, and retain talent to achieve strategic objectives and meet future business needs” (Silzer and Dowell 2010, p. 18) and is considered to be most effective when an organization develops a commitment to nurturing talent in order to meet organizational objectives (Silzer and Dowell 2010). However, according to the ASHE Higher Education report “Creating a Tipping Point: Strategic Human Resources in Higher Education,” there is “little formal programming in higher education that currently supports strategic talent management practices [and] as a result, universities lag behind industry in the development of practices to develop and retain talent” (ASHE 2012, p. 46).

A lack of commitment within higher education to the talent management planning strategies needed to attract, develop, and retain talent is problematic for the community as a whole, but when one considers the changing landscape of research libraries within higher education, their increasing need for new, complex, and technology-driven skills sets, and the impending reshaping of the workforce, the situation becomes more critical. The American Library Association estimates that by 2015, 30% of librarians will be over the age of 60, with the majority of these librarians retiring between 2015 and 2025 (Davis 2009). ARL has seen significant leadership change since 2005 with 103 of its 125 member libraries experiencing a change in executive leadership (e.g., directors, deans, university librarians); this represents an 82% turnover rate. And this trend only seems to be accelerating; since 2013 there has been an almost 26% turnover of

executive leadership in member libraries, with recruitments for 32 new leaders during that period.

Although a large number of librarians are projected to retire in the next decade, and executive library leadership is already retiring at a high rate, workforce demographics thankfully show that the number of younger librarians is increasing and library school enrollments are surging (Davis 2009). Since the library workforce will have both librarians new to the field as well as a large number of librarians retiring and nearing retirement, research libraries need to actively manage their talent and strategically develop their workforce in order to successfully recruit and retain new librarians while ensuring that the vacancies left by librarians retiring from the profession are filled by competent, experienced professionals.

This survey investigated which talent management strategies ARL libraries are deploying to manage and develop their organization's workforce. The talent management areas explored in the survey include talent strategy, recruitment and hiring, retention, employee engagement, job classification management, compensation management, performance assessment, competencies, professional development planning, and leadership and succession planning. The survey was distributed to the 125 ARL member libraries in July 2014, and 53 libraries, or 42%, responded to the survey by the August 4, 2014 deadline.

Forty-nine libraries responded to the question regarding union status. Of these, 53% (26 responses) are unionized, and 47% (23 responses) are not. At 19 of 43 responding libraries (44%) librarians have faculty status, and at 24 (56%) they have parallel status. Additionally, at 19 of 42 responding libraries (45%) librarians are eligible for tenure, at 16 (38%) they have

continuing appointments, and at 7 (17%) librarians have time-specific appointments. Other professional staff have faculty status at one of the 14 responding libraries (7%), and have parallel status at the other 13 (93%). In addition, 12% of the responding libraries (3 of 26) grant tenure, 69% (18 responses) have continuing appointments, and 19% (5 responses) have time-specific appointments for other professional staff.

### **Talent Strategy**

According to Edward Gubman, “connecting people to strategy to serve customers will build extraordinary results and long term value” (1998, p. 8). This section of the survey focused on assessing the talent strategy each responding library uses by determining which talent management activities are being undertaken, if these activities are aligned with a strategic plan or vision for the library, which talent management challenges the libraries are facing, and the staffing in place to support talent management strategy and programming. The survey responses indicate that most libraries are undertaking the traditional strategies to develop and manage their workforce. In fact, all 53 libraries reported offering professional development opportunities to their employees and 96% (51 responses) also conduct employee performance assessment of their workforce. However, among these libraries there is much lower use of either activities or programming to retain top talent (31 responses, or 58%), use of competencies for recruiting, managing, or developing employees (31 responses, or 58%), or compensation analysis (36 responses, or 68%).

Analysis of the data also indicates that talent management activities are not represented in the responding libraries’ organizational strategy. The percentages of libraries reflecting talent management strategies in their strategic plan ranged from a high of 43% (23 of 53 responses) for professional development opportunities to a low of 6% (3 responses) for job analysis/classification management and compensation analysis (also 3 responses). This lack of strategic focus on talent management activities may prove to be problematic for research libraries as they continue to evolve, require different skill sets, and see their work forces change as a large number of librarian retire in the near future.

When the respondents were asked to indicate the talent management-related challenges they are currently facing or will face in the next three years, 60% (31 of 52 responses) indicated that they were currently facing budget cuts that were affecting fiscal resources, although the percentage indicating they would still be facing budget restrictions in three years was considerably lower at 27% (14 responses). Another challenge facing these libraries is the current retirement of a large number of staff (23 responses, or 44%), with an even larger percentage reporting that they would be facing that problem in three years (36 responses, or 69%). These data are not surprising and seem to be supported by literature that indicates that the majority of librarians over the age of 60 will be retiring between 2015 and 2025 (Davis 2009). The answers to this question also foretold other themes that are seen throughout the other responses to the survey. Approximately 53% of the responding libraries (28 of 52) indicated that internal salary inequities are a current challenge, although somewhat surprisingly a much lower percentage of libraries (7 responses, or 13%) thought they would still be facing this challenge in three years. Another interesting theme that appeared was that 48% of the responding libraries (25 responses) felt that their current workforce was not able to be re-trained or re-skilled in order to meet the current organizational needs; in addition, a third of responding libraries (17 responses) also indicated that they were not finding job candidates that had the skills they needed. There were also numerous qualitative comments that underscore the challenge of recruiting IT positions, in particular.

Although almost all of the 50 responding libraries have a human resources professional employed by the library (44 responses, or 88%), fewer libraries reported having a training professional dedicated to employee professional development and training (15 responses, or 30%), an organizational development professional (14 responses, or 28%), or a strategic coordinator dedicated to managing the strategic plan (12 responses, or 24%).

### **Recruitment and Hiring**

“There is no doubt that recruiting the right employees can be challenging, but the rewards of a

well-constructed strategy are enormous, because effective recruiting is the foundation upon which any talent management program is built” (Breaugh 2009, p. 21). This section of the survey focused on learning what strategies or local circumstances have impacted the responding libraries’ success in recruitment, how successful the libraries have been in recruiting a specific set of skills, the relative importance of various credentials (e.g., MLS, MIS, PhD) when recruiting, the type of onboarding activities the responding libraries have undertaken, and the greatest challenges they have when onboarding new employees.

The survey asked respondents to indicate which strategies or circumstances had the most effect on the success of their recruitment efforts. The 50 responses show that most circumstances have a positive impact (determined by either a 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 having negative impact, 3 having a neutral impact, and 5 having a positive impact). The most positive strategies/circumstances include benefits packages, support for professional development, position responsibilities (41 responses each, or 82%), and work environment (40 responses, or 80%), followed by reputation of the institution (36 responses, or 72%), flexible work scheduling (30 responses, or 60%), employee engagement (29 responses, or 58%), sabbatical/professional/research leave (24 responses, or 48%), potential for promotion (21 responses, or 42%), eligibility for tenure/permanent status (19 responses, or 38%), and faculty status for librarians (17 responses, or 34%). The only circumstances or strategies that had a more equal balance of being either a positive or a negative were the salary range (both 18 responses, or 36%) and local cost of living (positive was 21 responses, or 42%; negative was 19 responses, or 38%).

The survey next asked how successful libraries were in recruiting staff with the following skill sets: language expertise, IT expertise, subject expertise, senior management/executive expertise, functional expertise or other. In general, the 51 respondents seem to have reasonable success in recruiting for all skill sets; however, they reported that they were less successful in recruiting for two skill sets (determined by either a 1 or 2 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all successful, 3 being neutral, and 5 being very successful): information technology expertise (9 of 51

responses, or 18%) and senior management/executive expertise (9 of 50 responses, or 18%).

Another interesting finding was that all 51 respondents unanimously indicated that a Master’s of Library Science was an important to very important degree for potential employees (determined by either a 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not at all important, 3 being important, and 5 being very important). Only 83% of them (42 responses) indicated the same for a Master’s of Information Science. The relative importance placed on the MLS as compared to the MIS does not seem to align with the importance of information technology expertise and skill sets that is seen in other responses throughout the survey.

Onboarding is “the process of helping new hires adjust to social and performance aspects of their new jobs quickly and smoothly” (Bauer 2010, p. 1) and the faster new employees are onboarded, the faster they can function effectively and contribute to the mission of the organization (Bauer 2010). The results of the survey show that many of the 51 responding libraries use traditional programming, relying on a new employee orientation at either the library (50 responses, or 98%) or the university/institution (49 responses, or 96%) to onboard their staff. A much smaller percentage use other onboarding techniques such as providing networking opportunities to new staff (28 responses, or 55%) or staff pairing such as job shadowing or coaching (20 responses, or 39%). The challenges to onboarding new employees that were most frequently cited by the responding libraries (31 responses) were: employees who were geographically dispersed, acclimating new employees to the culture of the organization, orienting new employees to the structure and roles within the library and in the larger institutional context, and the time it takes to develop and/or maintain an onboarding program.

## Retention

“Retaining the appropriate talent can determine the success or failure of the organization” (Phillips and Connell 2003, p. 5). Lack of employee retention can result in high financial costs, loss of productivity, loss of expertise, degradation in service quality, and decreased satisfaction of the remaining employees, and negative image of the organization (Phillips and

Connell 2003). This section of the survey investigated the impact of strategies or local circumstances on retention, the top three reasons employees leave the responding libraries, which positions are most difficult to retain, and whether the responding libraries track their voluntary turnover rates, and if so, what those rates are.

The responses to a question about which strategies or local circumstances impacted (either negatively or positively) their retention efforts very much mirrored the 50 respondents' answers to the parallel question in the previous recruitment and hiring section of the survey. Again, almost all circumstances have a disproportionately positive influence on retention (determined by either a 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being negative impact, 3 being neutral, and 5 being a positive impact). These include position responsibilities (38 responses, or 76%), employee engagement (37 of 49 responses, or 76%), support for professional development (37 responses, or 74%), work environment (37 responses, or 74%), benefits package (36 responses, or 72%), reputation of the institution (34 of 49 responses, or 69%), flexible work scheduling (32 responses, or 64%), eligibility for tenure/permanent status (26 responses, or 52%), local cost of living (22 responses, or 44%), potential for promotion (20 responses, or 40%), faculty status for librarians (20 responses, or 40%), and sabbatical/professional/research leave (20 responses, or 40%). Only salary range (negative: 17 responses, or 34%; positive: 18 responses, or 36%) had an equal balance of being seen as a positive or a negative.

The top three reasons employees leave their positions are retirement (35 of 50 responses, or 70%), other library employment opportunities (33 responses, or 66%), and other employment opportunities outside of libraries (21 responses, or 42%). The third statistic is interesting since it seems to indicate that there may be a high number of library employees leaving the field of academic librarianship.

When the survey asked respondents to identify the most difficult positions to retain within their organization, 63% (26 of 41 responses) indicated information technology positions; the next closest type of position was librarian at 27% (11 responses).

Since a lack of retention can be expensive and create a host of organizational and managerial

challenges, it is important to know the rate of employee turnover in an organization. Approximately half of the responding libraries track voluntary turnover rate (28 of 51 responses, or 55%) while about half did not (23 responses, or 45%). The turnover percentages reported ranged from 0% to 30%, but the majority of the responses indicated a turnover rate of 10% or below. According to the Society for Human Resources Management (2014), the industry wide average voluntary turnover rate is 13%.

## Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is defined as "the extent to which employees commit to something or someone in their organization, how hard employees work, and how long they stay as a result of that commitment" (Corporate Leadership Council 2004, p. 4). Research has shown that higher employee engagement is related to better performance and better employee retention (Corporate Leadership Council 2004). This section of the survey explored the responding libraries' assessment of employee engagement, the level of engagement within these libraries, and the levels of satisfaction with a variety of workplace issues.

The results indicate that 76% of the responding libraries (38 of 50 responses) have undertaken, or been a part of an assessment of employee engagement within the last five years. Twenty-eight of those libraries (74%) have been part of a campus wide survey and 14 (37%) have administered a library-focused assessment.

When asked to assess the level of engagement of their employees, 72% of the 47 responding libraries (34 responses) concluded that their staff were engaged or very engaged, with only 28% (13 responses) describing their staff as somewhat engaged or not at all engaged.

Employee engagement may or may not be aligned with employee satisfaction, so it is important to look at both (Society for Human Resource Management 2014). The survey asked respondents to report the level of employee satisfaction with a variety of workplace issues. The workplace issues that employees are most satisfied with (determined by a larger number of responses with either a 4 or 5 on a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being very dissatisfied, 3 being satisfied, and 5 being very satisfied) are: support for professional development (25 of 45 responses, or 56%), flexible work

scheduling (23 of 46 responses, or 50%), the benefits package (22 of 46 responses, or 48%), relationship with colleagues (21 of 46 responses, or 46%), relationship with their supervisor (14 of 46 responses, or 30%), sabbatical or research leave (14 of 45 responses, or 31%), tenure or permanent status track (13 of 46 responses, or 28%), and faculty status (10 of 46 responses, or 22%). The workplace issues that employees are least satisfied with (determined by a larger number of responses with either a 1 or 2) include: communication within the organization (28 of 46 responses, or 61%), salary (22 of 45 responses, or 49%), amount of work (19 of 45 responses, or 42%), opportunities for promotion within the organization (19 of 46 responses, or 41%), trust within the organization (17 of 46 responses, or 37%), selection process for promotion within the organization (12 of 44 responses, or 27%), and employee morale/engagement (11 of 46 responses, or 24%). Employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction with organizational climate/culture was equal.

### **Job Classification Management**

Job analysis is crucial in developing employees and their careers, maximizing their talent, designing learning, improving processes, assessing the value of positions, and managing job titles and classifications (Franklin 2005). This section of the survey assessed the responding libraries' approaches to job description management and job analysis. It also examined the types of positions that have seen the most change in job duties within their organizations, whether the responding libraries have seen significant changes in their job classification structures, and whether there have been some changes in paraprofessional duties.

The majority of the 51 responding libraries reported that they review their employees' job descriptions on a regular basis, specifically when there is a vacancy (47 responses, or 92%), during organizational restructuring (40 responses, or 78%), during performance appraisal/evaluation (37 responses, or 73%), and during performance planning (36 responses, or 71%). However, only 36% of the responding libraries (18 of 50 responses) indicated that they had conducted a systematic job analysis in the last five years to ensure alignment between the work being done and the job titles.

The responding libraries reported the most significant change in the job duties in functional specialist roles (22 of 49 responses, or 45%), information technology positions (22 of 51 responses, or 43%), senior/executive management positions (19 of 51 responses, or 37%), and technical services positions (18 of 50 responses, or 36%). Responses from 49 libraries indicate an approximately equal split regarding significant changes to their classification structure or series titles in the last five years, with 53% (26 responses) indicating that they had not experienced a significant change and 47% (23 responses) indicating they had. In addition, 88% of the responding libraries (44 of 50 responses) agreed with the statement that library support staff (e.g., paraprofessionals, library assistants, etc.) are taking on the responsibilities once considered professional librarian responsibilities. The qualitative comments overwhelmingly indicate that these duties are in technical services areas (primarily in cataloging) and reference services.

### **Compensation Management**

The compensation strategy of an organization must match the larger organizational strategy and the talent management strategy. Smart and successful organizations manage their compensation strategy through planning and regular assessment (Koss 2008). This section of the survey investigated the compensation management strategies used by the responding libraries and any compensation management challenges they are currently facing.

The results of the survey indicate that the majority of the 51 responding libraries do not employ a systematic approach to analysis of employees' compensation relative to the market. Only 26% of the respondents (13 responses) conduct this compensation analysis every one to four years and 8% (4 responses) analyze the data at intervals of 5 or more years. Sixty-five percent of the responding libraries (33 responses) take an ad hoc approach to compensation management with 51% (26 responses) conducting the analysis only on an as-needed basis and 14% (7 responses) reporting that they had never conducted this type of assessment.

When it comes to managing employees' compensation to address internal equity, more of the responding libraries adopt a systematic approach: 43% of them

(21 of 49 responses) reported that they adjusted compensation after a systematic review. Twenty-seven percent (13 responses) take a more ad hoc approach, adjusting compensation only after an employee raised a concern, and 20% (10 responses) indicated they don't make adjustments to employees' compensation.

Compensation management challenges are prevalent among 44 responding libraries: 66% (29 responses) indicated they are unable to offer competitive merit raises, 52% (23 responses) indicated that their salaries are not competitive with similar jobs external to the organization, and 41% (18 responses) indicated that salaries are not equitable within the organization.

### **Performance Assessment**

Performance assessment is the most commonly used management process and has a correlation with improved performance (Effron and Ort 2010). This section of the survey asked about the use and frequency of performance assessments, as well as which employees received assessments.

Nearly all of the responding libraries (50 of 51, or 98%) offer performance assessments annually. However, annual performance assessments are not conducted for all employee segments. Almost all library support staff and other professional staff (49 of 51 responses each, or 96%) receive annual performance assessments. Fewer professional librarians (41 responses, or 80%), unit managers (42 responses, or 82%), and executives (40 responses, or 78%) receive annual performance assessments. Qualitative data for those who receive appraisals on a non-annual basis show that some professional librarians receive biannual appraisals and tenured librarians tend to not receive appraisals. Several responses indicated that head librarians and deans receive appraisals every 5 years when their contracts were up for renewal.

The most prevalent challenges libraries face with performance assessments are inconsistency in ratings and rate inflation (23 of 47 responses, or 49%). Additionally, 19% (9 responses) indicated that staff compensation is not aligned with performance.

### **Competencies**

"A competency is a measurable characteristic of a person that is related to success at work. It may be a

behavioral skill, a technical skill, an attribute (such as intelligence), or an attitude (such as optimism)" (Lombardo and Eichinger 2001, p. 5). While the literature is not conclusive, it does suggest that the use of competencies has a positive influence on employee engagement, employee satisfaction, and manager success (Effron and Ort 2010). This section of the survey explored competency usage among libraries and identified the top critical competencies needed.

Thirty-one of 50 respondents (62%) have identified competencies for their employees. About two-thirds of these use or refer to competency models developed by one of the library associations. The others use models developed by their university or state human resources offices. When asked whether competencies are aligned with organizational strategy, responses presented a wide range of alignments: three of 24 respondents (13%) indicated they had identified competencies that are aligned with the library strategic plan and are used for all employees. One library has aligned competencies to the library strategic plan, but they only use them for non-librarian staff. The most prevalent theme was that the library used the university-defined competencies that were aligned with the university strategy (6 of 24 responses, or 25%).

The most compelling data from the competencies section identified the top critical competencies employees need to possess in order for libraries to be successful. Of the 31 respondents who answered the question, 45% (14 responses) indicated communication, 45% indicated collaboration and teamwork, and 32% (10 responses) indicated flexibility and adaptability. Some referred to the communication competency as having writing and verbal skills and others defined it as an organizational practice of internal and external communication.

### **Professional Development**

In a study by the Corporate Leadership Council (2004), personalized development plans and a commitment to employees' careers had a significant impact on discretionary effort put forth by employees. Additionally, training and development programs that use a mix of experience-based (on-the-job experience), people-based (learning through others such as mentors and coaching), and traditional learning methods (such as



training and reading) are considered the most effective and lasting programs (Lombardo and Eichinger 2001). This section captured the types of professional development activities, practices, and programs used within ARL libraries.

Of the nine talent areas explored in the survey, professional development is represented most in strategic plans. The survey asked about seven different types of professional development opportunities: travel funds, library-wide training offerings, individual training funds, experience-based development, leadership development programs, and customized development plans. Of the seven choices, travel funds (48 of 50 responses, or 96%), library-wide training offerings (47 responses, or 94%), and individual training funds (41 responses, or 82%) are the most prevalent offerings. Customized development plans are the least frequently offered (16 responses, or 32%). While funds for travel and training are consistently offered, the underutilization of customized development plans could be interpreted as a signal that ARL libraries may not be realizing their return on investment in professional development expenditures.

The survey also asked about the types of professional development plans offered to different types of employees. Training plans are the most common type of plan for library support staff, other professional staff, librarians, and department/unit managers. Leadership development plans are also common for librarians, department/unit managers, and other professional staff. For administrative managers, competency-based plans were the most frequently reported, followed closely by training and leadership development. Leadership development plans are the most common for library executives. When asked which plan type has been the most successful, 76% (25 of 33 responses) selected training plans.

### **Leadership and Succession Planning**

Leadership roles have been increasingly hard to fill with successful candidates (Charan, Drotter, and Noel 2001). Leaders are dealing with new work environments that require greater collaboration, higher volume of information, and new job responsibilities with wider scopes and high rates of change (Corporate Leadership Council 2013). This section of the survey

explored leadership development and succession planning offerings and practices at ARL libraries.

A fair number of ARL libraries (17 of 49 responses, or 35%) indicated that they had a leadership development program. Qualitative data from some of the libraries that did not have a leadership program indicated that they participated in other programs offered by the university, used external programs, or offered leadership development on an ad hoc basis.

Almost half of the respondents (22 of 47 responses, or 47%) indicated they identify High Potential Employees (HIPOs) within their libraries. Of those, most use the designation for prioritizing leadership development opportunities (17 of 22 responses, or 77%). Seven other libraries indicated they informally recognize such individuals.

Most of the respondents (39 of 48 responses, or 81%) indicated that they do not have a succession planning strategy. Qualitative data suggests that many organizations address succession decisions informally. Half of the respondents (25 of 50) indicated they typically hire executive staff from outside the organization and about a quarter (12 responses) indicated they primarily hire from within the organization. Of those who primarily hire from outside, 22% indicated the need for fresh perspective and skills. Of those who mostly hire from within the organization, 25% indicated that knowledge of internal practices, history, and culture is the primary reason. Thirteen respondents selected “other” and their comments show that most (10 responses, or 77%) hire equally from outside and within the organization.

### **Conclusion**

A robust use of a talent management strategy allows organizations to maximize their talent investment by attracting, retaining, and developing employees in a comprehensive way that is aligned to organizational strategies and goals. Research libraries are currently facing, and will continue to face, talent-related challenges as they require an increasingly dynamic and technology-driven workforce, more senior and experienced librarians and staff retire, and new librarians enter the profession requiring career and leadership development. The results of this survey highlighted two talent management trends in research libraries.

First, the results seem to indicate that most of the responding libraries are not using a systematic approach to deploying a talent management strategy. Many of the libraries indicated that they are undertaking some talent management activities such as professional development or performance assessment, but far fewer are deploying a comprehensive program with strategies, practices, and tools aimed at attracting, developing, and retaining top talent. The survey results in totality point to the lack of strategic and systematic programming, with most responding libraries addressing talent management through ad hoc, informal, or fractured approaches. However, some libraries have implemented talent management programs and the qualitative comments did indicate that others are either currently in early stages of development or are participating in talent management occurring at the institutional level.

The second trend illustrated in the survey results points to a widening skills gap in the workforce of ARL libraries. Many libraries reported that current employees are not able to be re-trained or re-skilled and job candidates do not have the skills required to meet libraries' needs as roles continue to change and require new skills and competencies. It is not

known definitively which skills are missing within the workforce since the survey did not ask explicitly for missing skills. However, information technology came up as a consistent theme when discussing difficulties in recruitment and retention.

In conclusion, talent management practices and tools are emerging best practices for organizations. While ARL libraries have not fully incorporated talent management strategies and practices into their organizations, some libraries are in the process of implementing some activities and practices into their long-term strategies and everyday work. The survey data show a need to connect talent management to organizational strategies, especially for addressing impending retirements and closing the skills gap. The authors believe the need to develop talent management capabilities should be addressed by individual organizations in strategic plans and comprehensive talent management programs. Likewise, professional associations should focus on adapting talent management best practices to the research library environment and provide professional development programs to support such practices. These efforts should be integrated in order to cultivate the talent needed to meet the demands of the modern research library.

## SURVEY QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

---

The SPEC Survey on Talent Management was designed by **Meredith A. Taylor**, Assistant Director for Organizational Development at the University of Texas at Austin Libraries, and **Elida Lee**, Director for Organization Effectiveness at the University of Texas at Austin. These results are based on data submitted by 53 of the 125 ARL member libraries (42%) by the deadline of August 4, 2014. The survey's introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

---

Talent management is "an integrated set of processes, programs, and cultural norms in an organization designed and implemented to attract, develop, deploy, and retain talent to achieve strategic objectives and meet future business needs" (Silzer and Dowell, 2010, p. 18). Talent management has never been more important to academic and research libraries as they respond to the evolving higher education environment and an impending reshaping of their workforces.

In its 2013 environmental scan the ACRL Planning and Review Committee declared "shifts in the higher education environment continue to have an impact on libraries in terms of collection/content development, access to and curation of new and legacy resources, and services for extended audiences" (ACRL, 2013, p. 2). The report adds that, "to be prepared for the future and be ready for new opportunities, many librarians and information professionals will re-envision their roles and define new opportunities. Anticipating and preparing for new roles and how these roles can expand and evolve over time will be key to an enduring, engaged, and thriving profession in the future" (p. 5).

Demographic data from ARL showed that in 2005 nearly half of the population of library professionals working in US member libraries were age 50 and over, and of those, nearly one-third were 55 and over (Wilder, 2007). This trend is also echoed by ALA, which estimates that by 2015, 30% of librarians will be over the age of 60, with the majority of these librarians retiring between 2015 and 2025 (Davis, 2009). Although a large number of librarians are projected to retire in the next decade, workforce demographics also show that the number of younger librarians is increasing and library school enrollments are surging (Davis, 2009). The impending reshaping of the workforce and new challenges within the higher education environment are driving a need for more robust human resource strategies. If academic and research libraries are to meet the evolving workforce needs of the profession and their institutions, they will need to study their workforce and make appropriate adjustments utilizing talent management strategies that will recruit, retain, and develop a workforce capable of meeting these evolved needs.

The purpose of this study is to determine if libraries are using talent management strategies in the recruitment, retention, and development of a workforce needed to support the transformation of academic and research libraries. This survey investigates the following areas related to talent management: talent strategy, recruitment and hiring, retention, employee engagement, job classification management, compensation management, performance assessment, competencies, professional development planning, and leadership and succession planning. This survey is interested in information about all library employees with the exception of student (undergraduate or graduate), temporary, seasonal, or contract employees.

## TALENT STRATEGY

---

The purpose of this section is to learn more about the overall talent strategy being employed by your library.

1. Please indicate which of the following talent management activities your library currently undertakes and which of these activities are represented in your library's strategic plan. Check all that apply. N=53

Talent Management Activities	Library currently undertakes	Is represented in strategic plan	N
Professional development opportunities	53	23	53
Employee performance assessment	51	5	51
Leadership development opportunities	45	14	48
Functional training	47	11	47
Activities/programming to increase employee engagement	41	19	42
Job classification analysis	38	3	38
Compensation analysis	36	3	36
Activities/programming to retain top talent	31	17	33
Competencies for use in recruiting, managing, and/or developing employees	31	7	32
Other activity	8	3	8
Total Responses	53	30	53

If you selected "Other activity" above, please briefly describe the activity(ies). N=8

Library Fellows Program, MIT Libraries Professional Research Grant Program, Librarian/Archivist Promotion Process, MIT Rewards and Recognition Program

Library-wide initiative to improve team building and communication—"culture change"—led by external consultant. Training grid to identify skills important to the library (both operationally and strategically) and to prioritize who needs those and how training will be sought/provided.

Managerial & Supervisory training program; Aboriginal Employment Strategy (paid MLIS internship)

Mentoring program for faculty

Mentoring program for tenure track faculty

Non-exempt staff development

Stretch assignments, promotional opportunities

The university has various initiatives in process, too.

**Additional Comments** N=4

Although the library doesn't have an internal leadership development program, the university supports attendance at external leadership development opportunities: Harvard Leadership Institute, Research Library Leadership Fellows, TRLN Management Academy, Minnesota Institute for Early Career Librarians, etc.

Leadership development opportunities are provided at institutional level.

Not all selected activities in the “library currently undertakes” column apply to all employee groups.

University professional development opportunities

2. Please indicate which of the following talent/workforce management challenges your library is currently facing, or will face in the next three years, and which of those challenges are addressed in your library’s strategic plan. Check all that apply. N=52

Talent Management Challenges	Library currently facing	Library will face in next 3 years	Is addressed in strategic plan	N
Retirement of a large number of staff	23	36	3	45
Budget cuts affecting fiscal resources	31	14	7	32
Internal salary inequities	28	7	0	29
Current employees not able to be re-trained or re-skilled	25	3	5	27
Job candidates not having the skills your library needs	17	8	2	20
Salaries are not competitive enough to attract new staff	16	9	1	19
Salaries are not competitive enough to retain existing staff	16	3	0	16
Downsizing of staff	14	5	0	16
Lack of work/life balance for staff	13	2	1	13
Not enough new librarians/library staff to fill vacancies	4	2	1	5
Other challenge	11	2	1	11
Total Responses	52	41	15	52

If you selected “Other challenge” above, please briefly describe the challenge(s). N=11

Campus personnel policies for staff and faculty tenure can discourage supervisors and administrators from pursuing time consuming and difficult steps to dismiss a non-productive employee. Staff and faculty who are mentally and emotionally tied to traditional tasks that could not be defined as somewhat obsolete. This is not necessarily a training issue, but one where employees define their value to the organization based on what they have traditionally done in their jobs.

Challenges in recruiting IT positions. Challenges of recruiting within the state civil service system.

Determining salaries for non-traditional librarian roles, like data curation, since the ARL data is not addressing it yet.

Downsizing of non-exempt support staff is being done through attrition with reassignment of funds to professional and Libraries faculty positions.

“Downsizing of staff” and “budget cuts affecting fiscal resources” have led to some changes in individual workload and activities.

Downsizing was limited to law library. Other challenges include inability to fill positions rapidly.

Lack of diversity in applicant pools

Level of salaries among IT staff in particular continues to pose challenges in recruitment and retention. Boston metro region poses challenges for recruiting in all positions.

Not enough technology staff to fill library vacancies.

Significant vacancies and turnover in the university's HR office is making it difficult to post positions and conduct searches.

The federal government hiring process itself, which has a unique framework and special requirements.

### Additional Comments N=2

Changes are current in the library. Staff is struggling with changes.

It is always a challenge to fill tech positions, and salaries in IT positions in general in academia are non-competitive.

3. Please indicate which of the following talent management positions you have within your library and which of these positions are part of your library's senior management/executive team. Check all that apply. N=50

Positions	Position employed by library	Part of library's senior management/executive team	N
Human Resources Professional	44	30	44
Training Professional (dedicated to employee professional development/training)	15	3	15
Organizational Development Professional	14	10	14
Strategic Coordinator (dedicated to managing the strategic plan)	12	10	12
Other talent management position	8	6	8
Total Responses	50	38	50

### If you selected "Other talent management position" above, please specify the position. N=8

Associate Dean for Assessment, Personnel & Research has general responsibilities for talent management. The directors of our individual libraries have responsibility for talent management of their respective librarian and staff members.

Associate University Librarian, Enterprise Services (oversees Human Resources and other administrative services)

AUL Administrative Services also does HR, OD work for libraries.

If by "professional" you mean those with educational credentials in human resources or organizational development, then we do not meet that qualification. We do however have an exempt (professional) staff member who manages our human resources and reports to the executive associate dean. Both engage in overseeing the HR, training, and talent management in our libraries.

Librarian/Associate Dean assigned HR duties; Assistant Dean assigned HR duties.

There are three HR librarian professionals: one on the senior executive team; one who manages personnel operations, including training and staff development; and one who specializes in recruiting.

We have a single position currently who has education and/or experience in organizational development and training.

Workforce Development Coordinator

#### Additional Comment N=1

The Assistant University Librarian for Administrative Services is responsible for coordinating the library's strategic initiatives. Although it is not the only focus of her role, it is part of her role.

## RECRUITMENT AND HIRING

The purpose of this section is to learn more about your library's recruitment strategies and challenges.

4. Please indicate the impact that the following strategies/local circumstances have had on the success of your library recruitment efforts on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=Negative impact on recruitment and 5=Positive impact on recruitment. Select N/A if a particular strategy/circumstance does not apply to your library. Please make one selection per row. N=50

Strategies/Circumstances	1 Negative impact	2	3 Neutral impact	4	5 Positive impact	N/A	N
Benefits package	0	3	6	23	18	0	50
Support of professional development	1	0	8	20	21	0	50
Position responsibilities	0	0	9	30	11	0	50
Work environment	0	1	9	27	13	0	50
Reputation of the institution	2	1	11	15	21	0	50
Flexible work scheduling	0	4	11	18	12	5	50
Potential for promotion	0	6	20	17	4	3	50
Local cost of living	9	10	10	12	9	0	50
Salary range	3	15	14	11	7	0	50
Employee engagement	0	0	20	19	10	0	49
Sabbatical, professional, or research leave	0	1	8	16	8	16	49
Librarians are eligible for tenure or permanent status	0	3	13	9	10	14	49
Librarians have faculty status	0	0	9	6	11	21	47
Other strategy/circumstance	2	1	2	7	1	4	17
Total Responses	12	32	45	49	44	32	50

If you selected "Other strategy/circumstance" above, please briefly describe the strategy/circumstance. N=11

### 1 Negative impact on recruitment N=2

Geographic distance from continental US is usually negative. However, proximity to Asia is attractive for some employees. Cultural/ethnic diversity is both positive and negative. Some employees are attracted by diversity; for others, it is too different here.

We are located in a relatively small northern city. Our cold climate and isolated location make us less desirable to candidates who do not have roots here. On the other hand, candidates who are from our city/province are eager to "come home" to work and live.

### 2 Somewhat Negative impact on recruitment N=1

Geographic location—we are a mid-sized city in the conservative south-central US. Culturally this is sometimes a negative impact on recruiting of individuals who have a negative perception whether accurate or not of the South.

### 3 Neutral impact N=1

Unionized support staff

### 4 Somewhat Positive impact on recruitment N=6

Funding to cover moving expenses

Geographical location: close to NY City and Philadelphia

Perception of long-term job security

Recruiting visits to top-related library programs to identify candidates for our post-Masters residency program.  
Recruiting practices that speed up the search process.

We have a tuition assistance program for our employees to obtain a degree useful for their position if that degree is not offered at our institution.

We have shifted away from faculty hires and now hire librarians under our professional and scientific rank.

### 5 Positive impact on recruitment N=1

Commitment to diversity, Boston region rich in cultural & natural attractions

### Comments N=5

For reputation of the institution, we would note that tenure status can have a positive or negative impact on recruitment depending on the candidate. While some librarians are interested in tenure status, other applicants may not be.

Libraries IT head was a tenured professor. The next head of the department will not be a tenure-track hire due to the 24/7 nature of the position.

Our university does not have a spousal hiring program, which at times can be a drawback. On the other hand we do have opportunity hires, which impacts us positively with diversity hiring.



Salary was having a negative impact on librarian recruitment, so we now have a candid conversation with candidates before phone or campus interviews about the salary range. This has been less of an issue with staff recruitment because salary ranges are listed in job postings.

We have not measured the impact of recruitment strategies and/or local circumstances with sufficient detail to answer this question. We can make general statements—our salary range is not a barrier to recruitment and that the cost of living is high—but not about the impact of specific actions.

5. Please indicate the level of success your library has had recruiting staff who have the following skill sets on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=Not at all successful and 5=Very successful. Select N/A if your library has not recruited for a particular skill set. Please make one selection per row. N=51

Skill Sets	1 Not at all successful	2	3 Successful	4	5 Very successful	N/A	N
Subject expertise (e.g., Chemistry)	0	2	18	15	16	0	51
Information technology expertise	1	8	18	18	6	0	51
Language expertise	0	6	15	13	6	11	51
Senior management/executive expertise (e.g., director/university librarians, associate and/or assistant directors/university librarians)	2	7	12	12	12	5	50
Functional expertise (e.g., copyright expertise)	0	4	12	18	10	5	49
Other skill set	0	2	0	1	0	2	5
Total Responses	2	22	38	37	27	18	51

If you selected “Other skill set” above, please briefly describe the skill set(s). N=2

Area studies expertise, which includes familiarity with foreign publishers and institutions.

Middle managers: those positions that are department head positions are hard to recruit externally. Fewer people who have some experience and are ready for leadership want to pick up and move. We recently had a very difficult time recruiting for a Head of Research Services and reorganized slightly and promoted internally.

Comments N=5

Easy to find subject/functional expertise to fill Librarian I and II positions; tougher for Librarian IV and AUL positions.

Language expertise varies as a factor, e.g., we have had difficulty attracting candidates with Hawaiian and Japanese language expertise, but other languages do not seem to be a problem.

Success in IT, subjects (Science & Engineering), and functional areas is greater with early-career positions. We use our post-MLS residency programs to recruit specifically for those skills. Recruiting mid-career librarians with those skill sets is more difficult.

We are eventually successful at most of these categories but not always the first time around.

We still require a high degree of language expertise especially in area studies and this is very difficult to find.

6. Please indicate how important the following credentials are when hiring for professional positions in your library on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=Not at all important and 5=Very important. Please make one selection per row. N=51

Credentials	1 Not at all important	2	3 Important	4	5 Very important	N
Master's of Library Science	0	0	15	12	24	51
Master's of Information Science	3	6	12	13	17	51
Doctor of Philosophy	23	18	8	2	0	51
Other terminal degree (e.g., JD, etc.)	12	14	16	3	3	48
Technical credentials (e.g., Microsoft certification, etc.)	11	12	17	8	1	49
Other credential	2	1	5	0	1	9
Total Responses	28	31	38	21	26	51

If you indicated above that an "Other credential" is important, please briefly describe the credential(s). N=6

### 3 Important N=5

Dependent upon position, other degrees, experience, and focus may be of importance.

For some department head positions, we have listed a second advanced degree as a preferred requirement.

In lieu of master's in LIS, master's degree in an area relevant to the job responsibilities.

Some positions allow for non-MLS credentials, e.g., archivist, conservator, preservation, special collections.

The MLS or EQUIVALENT advanced degree is required for librarian positions. We have latitude to determine the subject area of a master's degree that would be considered relevant/equivalent. "Other terminal degree" may be very important for a specific position (such as a JD for Scholarly Communication), but a second masters is not widely considered important for most librarian positions.

### 5 Very important N=1

We no longer require an MLS/MIS degree for a Libraries faculty position; a terminal degree in a discipline, typically the PhD, will also meet requirements.

### Comments N=8

Dean is the only position for which it is important to have a PhD and even then it is not required. We hire PhD but it is rarely a factor in determining the most qualified.

Educational requirements statement on faculty position announcements: Master's degree from an ALA-accredited program and/or terminal degree (typically a doctorate) in another relevant discipline.

Importance of credentials depends upon the position requirements.

Subject or functional expertise is more important than an MLS or MIS when hiring for faculty positions. Those hired as faculty who don't have an MLS are required to obtain one by the initial (candidacy) review.

The MLS or MIS is critical for most positions. For certain positions we will accept a PhD in lieu of MLS, but importance of PhD, JD, and other credentials is entirely dependent on the requirements of individual positions.

These requirements are very position dependent, and are required less frequently than in the past. It is not uncommon for us to develop our own experts from within the existing staff.

This is very specific to the job (even within the “librarian” category) so it is hard to generalize.

Varies by position as to importance of academic credentials vs. experience.

**7. Which of the following onboarding activities does your library undertake in order to orient and socialize new hires? Check all that apply. N=51**

New employee orientation to the library	50	98%
New employee orientation to the university/institution	49	96%
Functional training to new employees	41	80%
Formal mentorship program for new employees	29	57%
Sponsored social events	29	57%
Networking opportunities to new employees	28	55%
Other staff pairing such as job shadowing, coaching, etc.	20	39%
Other onboarding activity	11	22%

**Please briefly describe the other onboarding activity. N=11**

Assigning a buddy to a new librarian to help them navigate in the first few months.

Consortium (TRLN) orientation

Department orientation

For new faculty, 1-on-1 meetings with Sr. Associate University Librarian to thoroughly orient to rank and status (P&T) process and expectations. Typically these monthly meetings take 6–7 months.

New employee checklist

New employee tour

New Faculty Mentoring Program

Require participation in university’s new employee orientation and encourage participation in campus activities.

Staff sharing

Tour of Libraries (9 total)

Tours of various library departments are regularly offered on an ongoing basis, to any employees who wish, but are especially aimed at new employees.

**8. What is the greatest challenge your library has with regards to onboarding of new staff? N=31**

A significant part of the onboarding falls to department chairs who approach this differently. The quality varies.

Acclimating staff to library organization.

Acculturating them to the unique culture, local language, and protocols of Hawaii (if they are not local). For example, when do you present someone with a lei?

Achieving consistent orientation of employees across departments.

Assisting them in gaining an understanding of the organizational structure and the roles and services of the wide variety of units within the campus library system and understanding unique role of Libraries faculty in learning and research.

Charged a newly formed Employee Engagement Team to develop an onboarding program for all library employees. Their biggest challenge (or opportunity) is starting almost from scratch; there is a Librarian Association that has a local committee on Welcoming, Orientation & Mentoring that has not developed a programmatic approach in the past, but these two groups are working together on developing programs.

Communicating all the necessary "new employee" details. Introducing new employees to colleagues outside of their unit/department. Physical separation of employees at various locations.

Coordination between university and library efforts

Delays in university services related to onboarding new staff; e.g., setting up the person's IT account.

Diffuse locations make it difficult to get everyone together.

Ensuring that they have a consistent view of the library's strategic directions, organizational structure, and that they understand the 'big picture' when it comes to planning and directions.

Ensuring that they meet people from across the library and learn about areas besides just their own department.

Focus has been on librarians, so staff employees are only exposed to the one-day orientation provided by the university and functional training in their departments. The challenge is balancing time away from assigned duties with the need for better organizational knowledge and socialization. A second challenge is connecting the dots between information about a candidate's competencies and strengths collected during recruitment and on-going professional development/performance management. We treat each of the talent management areas as if they are discrete activities. They would be much more powerful if we were more intentional about connecting the dots.

Getting them familiar with other divisions where they do not work.

It is challenging to find the "right" timing for different information. What do they need immediately? What will be forgotten if delivered too soon? Different positions have different information needs. It is difficult to create a standard experience while maintaining the individuality needed.

Lack of a mentorship program for new employees

Making them feel a part of our large organization.

None; we have a documented process, strong materials, engagement of staff at all levels, excellent communication strategies and processes to check in on performance prior to the end of the initial 90-day period.

Orienting the new employee to the university.

Our greatest challenges in onboarding new staff are timing and size. New employee orientations occur quarterly, and more often than not, attendees have figured out the essential information by then. More frequent programs are not influenced by the turnover/ new hire rate.

Providing all the appropriate training needed to assume the new position.

Scheduling for orientation programming.

The fact that there is so much information that they need to absorb or be aware of beyond the specifics of their position; also, acclimating them to our culture.

The time to develop and maintain an active onboarding program.

Time commitment on the part of the new staff and on the part of the organizers and presenters of the library program.

Time is a factor because we do not have a position dedicated to centralized library training. So it falls to supervisors and department heads, which leads to inconsistency. It is also a challenge to keep up with change and have flexible dynamic program of on boarding.

Orientation is limited to benefits information. In the decentralized environment, I think it would be helpful for the university to offer a more comprehensive orientation to the institution. At the library, we have five locations. This separation can be a challenge.

We are a very large system; it takes time to learn about us.

We don't have a formal mentorship or on-boarding program. We have many unit libraries spread across the city and it is difficult for new people to get to know everyone. Candidates who are not originally from our city/province often have a hard time adjusting to living in a city where most people are "from here." Friends and family networks are well established and it can be difficult for new staff, especially those that come here alone to become part of the community.

We have a well-developed orientation system, but it takes time to complete.

We have many libraries on campus. It can be challenging for new employees to meet others outside of their immediate work area or functional area.

## RETENTION

---

The purpose of this section is to learn more about your library's retention strategies and challenges.

9. Please indicate the impact that the following strategies/local circumstances have had on retaining your library's employees on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=Negative impact on retention and 5=Positive impact on retention. Select N/A if a particular strategy/circumstance does not apply to your library. Please make one selection per row. N=50

Strategies/Circumstances	1 Negative impact	2	3 Neutral impact	4	5 Positive impact	N/A	N
Position responsibilities	0	2	10	28	10	0	50
Support of professional development	0	3	10	23	14	0	50
Work environment	0	3	10	30	7	0	50
Benefits package	0	3	11	19	17	0	50
Flexible work scheduling	0	2	10	16	16	6	50
Librarians are eligible for tenure or permanent status	0	1	8	11	15	15	50
Local cost of living	6	7	14	14	8	1	50
Potential for promotion	2	8	18	14	6	2	50

Strategies/Circumstances	1 Negative impact	2	3 Neutral impact	4	5 Positive impact	N/A	N
Sabbatical, professional, or research leave	0	0	14	11	9	16	50
Librarians have faculty status	0	2	8	9	11	20	50
Salary range	3	14	15	10	8	0	50
Employee engagement	0	1	11	31	6	0	49
Reputation of the institution	1	1	13	15	19	0	49
Other strategy/circumstance	3	2	1	0	2	5	13
Total Responses	11	30	47	49	42	30	50

If you indicated above that an “Other strategy/circumstance” had an impact, please briefly describe the strategy/circumstance. N=7

### 1 Negative impact on retention N=3

Extreme budgetary and pension reform challenges within the state have a huge impact on retention. Faculty were actively recruited by the previous dean to his new library—we lost five employees to that institution in a few months. The negative attitude of the faculty towards the policies of the upper administration on campus led to retirements and departures. Faculty members scared untenured faculty members that they would not get tenure and so those individuals left—they would have earned tenure.

Geographical distance from continental US makes frequent travel for conferences prohibitively expensive, and the library cannot fully fund all travel.

Regional culture can impact retention if the individual is not comfortable or well socialized in the community and desires a different type community—particularly a more urban, diverse community.

### 2 Somewhat Negative impact on retention N=2

Hiring opportunities for the employee’s spouse/partner.

Salary RANGE is not a problem (we don’t have assigned ranges), but lack of funding due to budget cuts is beginning to impact our ability to make competitive retention/counteroffers.

### 5 Positive impact on retention N=2

Commitment to diversity. Boston region is rich in cultural & natural attractions.

Our university is one of the largest and most secure employers in the metropolitan area, which makes us very attractive as staff employer. Employees who are recruited from outside the state find it to be a great place to live and frequently end up staying here much longer than they planned.

### Comments N=5

Answers would be different on some of the questions if separated by support and professional staff.

For “Librarians are eligible for tenure or permanent status”, this has had both a positive and negative impact on retention depending on the individual person and situation.

Not all librarians here have tenure or permanent status.

Reputation of the institution seems to be the strongest factor.

We have not measured the impact of retention strategies and/or local circumstances with enough detail to answer this question. We can make general statements, but not about the impact of specific actions.

**10. Which of the following positions are typically difficult to retain in your organization? Check all that apply. N=41**

Information technology positions	26	63%
Librarian positions	11	27%
Executive management positions	8	20%
Library support positions (i.e., paraprofessional, library assistants, etc.)	8	20%
Functional specialist positions (e.g., copyright, scholarly communication, data management, etc.)	7	17%
Other position	3	7%

**Please specify the other position(s) that are typically difficult to retain. N=3**

Administrative support

No positions are 'typically difficult' to retain; turnover seems to occur in waves, e.g., we lost two AUL's recently, but those positions had been filled for many years.

Rare materials and special collections professionals

**Comments N=10**

Early career librarians are the most difficult to retain, often able to leverage their position to obtain promotional opportunities at other institutions. Once established at mid-career level, retention is typically less of a challenge.

For the past 5+ years, we have been fairly successful in our retention efforts. However, due to six years of no raises by the state, and an improving economy nationwide, we are now experiencing a sudden wave of our librarians being recruited by other universities. This seems to be across the board, rather than affecting any specific category of position.

IT positions are not faculty and are sometimes better compensated than faculty positions. IT professionals are in a different union.

Most library staff stay at the university for a long time, if not the duration of their careers. Staff in information technology positions may seek advancement within other university units. Librarians may be recruited for advanced positions in other organizations.

Most of our turnover is in the librarian ranks, but we do not have a high rate of turnover.

Our greatest retention challenge is in our IT positions. However, our retention rate even in IT is above the average. Support positions represent the next greatest challenge. This is sometimes because MLS holders are seeking a professional position and one is not open.

Overall we have not had issues with retention. We have very low turnover rate except for retirements of long-term employees. Even our deans stay for a decade or more before moving on.

The university does not offer salaries that are competitive with other local employers for information technology positions. The tuition benefits help compensate for the salary issues, but we have a higher turnover in this job category than for others.

There is a lot of turnover among exempt staff and supervisors as well as clerical staff who move on to better positions elsewhere.

We have very little turnover or retention issues. Most employee have been here 25, 30, 35 years.

#### 11. Please select the top three reasons employees leave your library. N=50

Retirement	35	70%
Other library employment opportunities	33	66%
Other employment opportunities outside of libraries	21	42%
Salary	15	30%
Geographic location	8	16%
Failure to attain promotion	6	12%
Work environment	3	6%
Relationship with supervisor	3	6%
Position responsibilities	3	6%
Local cost of living	3	6%
Failure to attain tenure or permanent status	2	4%
Benefits package	1	2%
Reputation of the institution	1	2%
Support of professional development	0	—
Employee engagement	0	—
Relationship with colleagues	0	—
Sabbatical, professional, or research leave	0	—
Flexible work scheduling	0	—
Faculty status	0	—
Other reason	13	26%

#### Please briefly describe the other reason(s). N=13

59% leave for personal reasons, for example family- or medical-related.

Better opportunities for the person's spouse

Following spouse to other positions

Health-related; end of long-term disability benefits

Impact of change in duties and direction as a result of restructuring

Long-term disability

Personal circumstances



#### Personal reasons

Personal reasons such as marriage, family responsibilities such as taking care of an aging parent, or spouse taking another job.

Relocating due to employment of spouse/partner.

Relocating for family reasons.

Spouse takes a position outside the area—particularly true of younger employees.

Want to return to their home base, i.e., where they grew up or obtained their MLS. Also, they leave to trail a spouse or significant other.

#### Comments N=5

Based on our demographics, we anticipate retirement will also be a top reason for the next several years.

For “Failure to attain tenure or permanent status,” I have considered those who have left during the tenure process (due to the tenure process) but prior to the final tenure decision to be included in this category.

Limited opportunity for career advancement within the organization is one reason cited for seeking “other library employment.”

Some also leave when they find that they don’t really want to manage/factor research into their responsibilities.

We have almost no turnover.

#### 12. Do you track the voluntary turnover rate in your library? N=51

Yes	28	55%
No	23	45%

#### If yes, what is your typical turnover rate for a 12-month period? N=26

0

3%

5.31%

7%

10%

10%

0.714

1–2 persons per month

14 including resignations and retirements.

2–3%

20–30% over last two years

2014: 10.5%, 2013: 2.4%, 2012: 4.1%, 2011: 1.6%, 2010: 3.8%

3–5% for the past several years.

4–8%

5% average for staff at all ranks

6–8% including retirements

7–9%

8–12%

About 3% on average

About 5%

Average voluntary turn over rate for the past five years has been 12 per calendar year. The 12-month rate will rise slightly this year due largely to retirements of non-exempt staff prompted by impending changes in their pension plan payout rate.

In recent years it has averaged about six per year and most were retirements.

Minimal

Turnover for library in FY 13 was 7.9%.

Typical turnover rate is less than/equal to 1%.

With retirements, about 7%

---

## EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT

---

The purpose of this section is to learn more about your library's assessment of employee engagement, the level of employee engagement within your library, and any challenges you have around employee engagement. (Employee engagement is defined as the extent to which employees commit to something or someone in their organization, how hard they work, and how long they stay as a result of that commitment.)

### 13. Has your library conducted, or been a part of a campus-wide employee engagement survey or organizational climate assessment within the last five years? N=50

Yes	38	76%
No	12	24%

If yes, what type of assessment(s) have you administered or been a part of? Check all that apply.  
N=38

Campus-wide assessment	28	74%
Library-focused assessment (e.g., ClimateQUAL)	14	37%
Proprietary assessment (e.g., Gallup)	5	13%

**14. Research has shown that engaged employees routinely go above and beyond what is expected of them. Overall, how engaged are the employees of your library? N=47**

Not at all engaged	1	2%
Somewhat engaged	12	26%
Engaged	25	53%
Very engaged	9	19%

**Comments N=14**

**Very engaged N=2**

In spite of low entry-level salaries we are fortunate to be able to recruit talented and engaged new colleagues.

Our engagement score is 71% (7 out of 10 employees are engaged).

**Engaged N=5**

Campus-wide employee engagement survey was conducted in 2011 and 2013, with the next one planned for 2015.

Engagement is high overall. In some cases it is believed to reflect a commitment to the profession more than to this particular work environment.

Participation in committees, in-house Research Libraries seminar, attendance at weekly and monthly staff meetings

They are engaged to very engaged.

We have not completed a library survey so I have nothing reliable to base this on. It is my perception and it is the overall result of the campus engagement survey. Those results were not reported by department; only in the aggregate. Our employees have tended to stay a long time in their jobs, which is a double-edged sword. While some do stay engaged others disengage over time and ride it out to retirement.

**Somewhat engaged N=4**

Between somewhat engaged and engaged

Faculty are more engaged than staff. Question does not specify engagement in library, campus, and/or community.

Hard to generalize across the entire library, the tone is different in various departments.

While we have participated in ClimateQUAL, we haven't participated in an engagement survey so it is difficult to accurately estimate the level of engagement.

**Other Comments N=3**

Cannot answer this question for the staff as a whole. Individuals run the range from "not" to "very."

Reports were not shared at the unit level. Only composite university-wide data were shared.

We did not get results based on library staff only.

15. Please indicate how satisfied your employees have reported they are about the following workplace issues on a scale of 1 to 5 where 1=Very dissatisfied and 5=Very satisfied. Select N/A if your library has not received staff feedback about a particular issue. Please make one selection per row. N=46

Workplace Issues	1 Very dissatisfied	2	3 Satisfied	4	5 Very satisfied	N/A	N
Relationship with colleagues	0	2	16	13	8	7	46
Benefits package	1	1	14	14	8	8	46
Relationship with supervisor	0	5	20	13	1	7	46
Flexible work scheduling	0	2	9	10	13	12	46
Organizational climate/culture	2	6	24	8	0	6	46
Employee morale/engagement	3	8	22	5	0	8	46
Tenure or permanent status track	0	2	13	7	6	18	46
Trust within the organization	2	15	20	3	0	6	46
Faculty status	0	2	10	6	4	24	46
Opportunities for promotion within the organization	3	16	17	1	0	9	46
Communication within the organization	5	23	13	1	0	4	46
Support of professional development	1	5	9	12	13	5	45
Sabbatical, professional or research leave	0	2	13	6	8	16	45
Amount of work	3	16	17	2	1	6	45
Salary	7	15	10	4	1	8	45
Selection process for promotion within the organization	3	9	18	1	0	13	44
Other workplace issue	0	4	1	0	1	9	15
Total responses	10	39	40	37	28	33	46

If you selected "Other workplace issue" above, please briefly describe the issue(s) and type of feedback. N=5

## 2 Somewhat dissatisfied N=4

Decision-making process is not transparent. The right people are not always involved to the extent they wish to be in decision-making.

Favoritism

Lack of leadership and management opportunities

One issue is the workplace environment. The building is aging and has outdated furnishings.

## 5 Very satisfied N=1

The campus survey contained a section about the "physical environment of the unit." Questions touched on computer support, availability of necessary equipment, the safety of the work area, and the adequacy of the space.

## Comments N=12

A campus-wide staff well-being survey was conducted in April. Results have not yet been distributed.

Again, the answers to these particular issues (above) vary enormously across the library organization both by type of work and level of employee.

Communication is always an issue for someone. The information above comes from exit interviews.

Do not track.

I cannot answer the questions about employee satisfaction because we have no reliable data to report. There has been no survey for library employees' job satisfaction.

If librarians and staff were ranked on these issues separately, the answers would show some distinct differences of opinion.

Questions should differentiate between staff and faculty. It makes a difference on response. Again, many changes are occurring at this time causing low morale.

Results from a university-wide staff engagement survey and a workplace culture audit point to strengths as well as priorities for improvement. However, those assessments asked about priorities, opportunities, values, and about agreement/disagreement with specific statements. The results do not map well to the satisfied/dissatisfied scale of this question. Among the priorities for improvement that library staff cited most frequently are compensation, leadership, change management, and communication. Among those who indicated they might leave the university, the most common reasons cited include reducing stress, improving opportunities for career advancement, finding a more supportive work environment, to increase salary, and retirement.

The culture survey was conducted this past spring; no results have been shared at this point, so my answers would be guesses based on anecdotal rather than survey data.

The ratings for some of this would likely vary if we separated it by employee classification (staff, faculty, etc.)

We do not have access to the survey data at this level of granularity for our organization for these issues and are unable to respond.

We underwent a reorganization in 2012 and assessed our goals of the reorganization at 6/12/18 months and those assessments indicate that 60% of staff are satisfied that we are moving in the right direction post-reorg.

## JOB CLASSIFICATION MANAGEMENT

---

The purpose of this section is to learn more about your library's approach to managing your job titles, classifications, and series.

### 16. When are your employee's position descriptions/job profiles reviewed to determine if they reflect the work being performed? Check all that apply. N=51

When there is a vacant position	47	92%
During organizational restructuring	40	78%
During performance appraisal/evaluation	37	73%
During performance planning (i.e., manager/employee setting expectations for the next year)	36	71%
Other opportunity	7	14%

**Please briefly explain the other opportunity for reviewing position descriptions. N=7**

At the request of staff or supervisor, especially when significant new duties have been added.

At the request of the employee

Central HR is currently in the process of reviewing all position descriptions relevant to positions in the libraries. This is a unique process, and not the norm.

If requested by the employee.

Position descriptions for staff and academic professional employees are reviewed every three years under the State Civil Service system. Faculty job descriptions are reviewed when there is a vacancy or new position.

Some library managers review job descriptions annually.

Upon the determination the position has changed by unit head.

**17. Please indicate the amount of change in the job duties for the following positions in your organization in the last five years. Please make one selection per row. N=51**

Positions	No change	Changed somewhat	Significant change	N
Senior/executive management positions (e.g., director/university librarians, associate and or assistant directors/university librarians, etc.)	5	27	19	51
Subject specialist positions	5	36	10	51
Library support positions (e.g., paraprofessionals, library assistants, etc.)	6	35	10	51
Information technology positions	3	26	22	51
Liaison positions	9	27	14	50
Technical services positions	2	30	18	50
Functional specialist positions (e.g., copyright, scholarly communication, data management, etc.)	5	22	22	49
Other position	0	2	0	2
Total Responses	18	50	40	51

**If you selected "Other position" above, please specify the position(s) and amount of change. N=2**

Communications and events programming

Curatorial positions in our Special Collections & Archives

**Comments N=6**

All of our positions went through an analysis as part of our reorg and some changed as indicated. We did not have functional specialists before our reorg, but are currently considering adding functional support positions in scholarly communication, copyright, and data management.

Library technicians and assistants are under a statewide civil service recruitment system, so the library has no ability to change job duties. As a result, there has been a trend away from civil service to paraprofessionals.

“Significant change” in functional specialist positions reflects the creation of new positions more than changes made to previously existing positions.

Subject specialist positions and liaison positions are one and the same.

We have no liaison positions.

We opened a new library with a lot of advanced technology that has required our IT staff to move into new areas to support large scale visualization and other advanced media. Subject/liaison positions are currently under review with significant changes expected in the near term.

**18. Within your library are support staff (e.g., paraprofessionals, library assistants, etc.) taking on responsibilities that were once considered professional librarian responsibilities (e.g., reference, cataloging, etc.)? N=50**

Yes	44	88%
No	6	12%

**If yes, please briefly describe the activities. N=34**

Bibliographic assistants in cataloging and information delivery (reference & instruction)

Cataloging and reference, acquisitions

Cataloging support, department management, project management

Civil service staff have taken on the day-to-day cataloging operations and some original cataloging.

Digital resource management, original cataloging, reference

Information desk, pre-cataloging, indexing, data management, quality assurance

In public services, we have moved away from having reference librarians at service desks and have developed “service manager” roles for our library technicians. Acquisitions and cataloging departments were merged recently, requiring significant cross training of support staff with a growing focus on managing electronic resources. Library technicians have long been performing original cataloging in our organization.

Increased responsibilities on public service desks are one example.

Instruction and content development, LibGuides, library orientations, reference

Library assistants provide service at the information desk, for copy cataloging, and some electronic resource management.

Library support staff are staffing a help desk, rather than a reference desk. Classified staff are teaching lower level classes. Library support staff are performing some duties of technical services librarians.

Management of day-to-day operations of libraries and other units, include supervision of other support staff; reference, cataloging.

More reference work, both in-person and virtual. Some more advanced technical services, electronic resources.

Mostly in cataloging and acquisitions, somewhat at our reference desk

Mostly not, but in one library, clerical staff are staffing the reference desk.

Original cataloging is often done by paraprofessionals, and paraprofessionals often provide assistance at many service desks (where it is hard to draw a hard line between "reference" and just general assistance).

Over time the distinctions between staff responsibilities and librarian responsibilities have become less clear. We have hired employees with the credentials to be librarians to do staff work in some cases. Primarily, the overlap comes in reference responsibilities, although it has also come up once or twice in teaching.

Personnel librarian is now HR Manager. Budget director is now MBA rather than MLS. Public Services director is now a high level management professional rather than an MLS. Most of our IT positions, except for department head and senior administrators, are IT professionals rather than MLS, although some of them have MLS degrees that are not required of their positions. And of course most cataloging is done by staff rather than MLS librarians.

Reference

Reference is triage model. Librarians don't serve on desks any longer. Faculty catalogers handle original cataloging only. All copy, including addition of subject headings and some classification work, is done by non-faculty personnel.

Reference and cataloging responsibilities

Reference and copy cataloging, but not for a majority of the time

Reference desk activities and cataloging

Reference desk hours are covered by paraprofessionals. Professionals are "on call."

Reference, catalog maintenance, cataloging

Reference, cataloging

Reference, cataloging, and mid-level management. Over 50 positions were reclassified during and after our reorganization.

Reference, cataloging, research

Routine reference inquiries

Taking on circulation, reference, and cataloging responsibilities

Technical services: acquisitions, cataloging

Technical services: original cataloging, project management. Frontline reference: librarians no longer have scheduled reference except in the branches.

The Access Services staff field most service desk questions, then refer patrons to research librarians (to chat, on call, or by appointment).

This change is not recent at our library.

**Answered No** N=1

This was more of a trend in the past.



**19. Have there been any significant changes in your library's classification structure(s)/series of titles over the past five years (e.g., you have added or eliminated titles, significantly changed job duties associated with a title, etc.)? N=49**

Yes	23	47%
No	26	53%

**If yes, please briefly describe which classification(s) changed and why. N=19**

Added new positions, revised vacant positions before reposting, and revised positions to reflect changing strategic priorities.

All bargaining unit (unionized) staff moved to highest level based on need.

As mentioned, we are in the process of reviewing all of our positions as to structure, title, etc.

Copy cataloguers are now Metadata Specialists. As Metadata Specialists, their scope is broader.

Created new system for staff classification to make them clearer and equitable.

Duties have changed as a result of vacancies that haven't been filled.

Faculty positions formerly designated as "(subject) Librarian" are now "(subject) Information Specialist." Non-exempt "operations coordinator" positions became exempt "operations manager" positions.

Librarian and paraprofessional to reflect strategic planning goal

More staff professional positions (Library Managers)

Non-tenure track librarians have developed a new classification and promotion system.

Our institution implemented enterprise software and concurrently revamped all job classifications.

Senior management titles were changed from director to associate/assistant university librarian. Middle manager titles were changed from team leader to head (e.g., Head, Science Research Services). These changes were part of the Libraries' reorganization process. Some modifications were made to existing job responsibilities as part of this process.

Shift from civil service employees to paraprofessional (we call them Administrative, Technical, and Professional).

Standardized library original cataloger. University and library are currently reviewing level of all non-exempt library positions.

The IT and the administrative assistant job categories have been re-banded by the university.

University HR is redoing classification of positions.

We have Academic Professional and Administrative Support Professional as new classifications.

We have added Outreach and Instruction Librarian as a title and promoted various people from Librarian 1 to Librarian 2 with this new title.

With our reorganization our leadership structure changed from "department heads" to "program directors" for several reasons—one was to eliminate 1-to-1 reporting relationships; two was to remove the term "department" from our vocabulary as the term department is used to identify the "Libraries" at the university-level; and third was the result of the changes to our organizational structure.

**Answered No N=1**

A statewide career banding process for library support positions was completed in 2008, and there have been no changes since that time.

**20. Has your library conducted a systematic job analysis within the last five years to make sure the work being done is aligned to the job title? N=50**

Yes	18	36%
No	32	64%

**Comments N=18**

**Answered Yes N=13**

A task analysis of library assistant (non-exempt) positions is now in progress.

Bargaining unit upgrade; librarian job description update in progress

For library support staff, a new performance management tool was adopted two years ago that required review of each position description.

In progress and to be ongoing for 1–2 years

In some classifications

In the IT area

Librarian positions reviewed for market equity. Staff positions were all reviewed in 2007.

Reviewed all paraprofessional jobs a few years ago and academic staff are reviewed during evaluations and requests for promotion.

This is done on an individual basis.

We have analyzed clerical and exempt positions.

With recent turnover comes the opportunity to review position descriptions.

With the assistance of university human resource services, job analysis was conducted.

Yes for librarian and other exempt level positions; no for support staff.

**Answered No N=5**

As mentioned above, all non-faculty librarian jobs are reviewed every three years but the library has not conducted a separate one-time job analysis outside of this regular process.

I answered no to both questions although we did do a systematic job review of non-exempt and exempt position in 2008. However, all of this work, i.e., changes to classification structure and systematic job review, is completed at the campus HR level or even the system HR level and not at the departmental level.

The review and reclassification of positions is ongoing.

We routinely do this, so there has not been a need to conduct a system-wide analysis.

We underwent a major conversion to a new classification system just over five years ago. At that time, all staff positions were reviewed.

## COMPENSATION MANAGEMENT

---

The purpose of this section is to learn more about your library's compensation management strategies, and any challenges your library has experienced around compensation management.

### 21. How often does your library analyze employees' compensation relative to market data? N=51

On an "as needed" basis	26	51%
Every year	7	14%
Every two to four years	6	12%
Every five to ten years	2	4%
More than every ten years	2	4%
Have never conducted a market compensation analysis	7	14%
Other	1	2%

#### Comments N=17

##### On an "as needed" basis N=8

As university funding allows.

Both our librarians and support staff belong to unions. Compensation is often a bargaining issue.

For librarians, we track and analyze compensation "in-house." Due to six years with no significant salary increase pool, we have not been able to address issues. For support staff, market analyses are done at the state level; the last was in 2008.

Librarians may apply for salary adjustments based, in part, on market data. Other more systematic analyses are conducted periodically, but not on a regular schedule.

Many of the library's positions are covered by collective bargaining agreements, which directly impacts compensation. Additionally, the faculty (tenure system and non-tenure system) have recently ratified their first union contract affecting increases retroactively to August 2012.

This analysis is conducted by campus human resources rather than by the library.

We could probably not match some of the salaries that would come to light in an analysis of market data.

We use the ARL salary survey information annually.

##### Every year N=2

Applies to library professionals only.

Market data for support staff positions is difficult to find.

### Every two to four years N=3

Campus does it for IT job categories every 2–3 years.

Our plan is to analyze employees' compensation every three years.

University-wide compensation conducted only for the Management and Professional Staff group (this group is primarily made up of managers and the consultants in the functional areas of Human Resources, Finance, Information Technology, Marketing, Communications, University Relations).

### More than every ten years N=2

It has been at least 10 years under a different administration.

Market analysis is the responsibility of university human resources.

### Have never conducted a market compensation analysis N=1

The university's human resources department would do this each time a new faculty collective agreement is bargained with the faculty union. The library does not do this work.

### Other N=1

The library does not do this, although we often apply it as needed. The campus HR does this for staff positions. Provost's office does it for faculty and other academic personnel.

## 22. When do you make adjustments to individual employees' compensation in order to address internal equity, which occurs when people feel that performance or job differences result in corresponding differences in pay rates? N=49

After a systematic review of internal equity for employees in a title, department, or across the library	21	43%
When an employee raises a concern about their pay relative to another employee who is in a similar position	13	27%
We don't make adjustments to individual employees' compensation to address internal equity	10	20%
Other	5	10%

### If you selected "After a systematic review" above, how often to you undertake such a review? N=16

Annual. We also make adjustments in response to employee concerns, but the survey does not allow multiple answers.

As needed. Adjustments to individual employee compensation are also conducted when an employee raises a concern about their pay.

As university funding allows.

Campus policies limit the timing and rationale. Typically, we make adjustments when employees receive their annual pay raises.

Every 2 to 4 years

Every three years for faculty only

Generally, we do this annually, but for different groups of staff.

Our plan is to review every three years.

Systematic reviews are usually done campus-wide.

Systematic reviews of library staff salary levels are conducted by university HR. Recommendations for changes in existing salary levels are provided by HR based on a statistical analysis of staff within a specific university level.

This is an ongoing process and is looked at every year at a minimum.

This review is implemented by the university, not the University Libraries.

We conduct over-all reviews twice annually—at budget development and again at salary setting. In addition to market data, internal equity and supervisor feedback is considered for retention purposes.

We review equity among librarians and exempt staff annually when setting salaries. Clerical wages are governed by the union contract and we typically do not make adjustments.

When an anomaly seems apparent, we investigate.

Yearly, after annual evaluations are completed.

#### **Additional Comments N=11**

When an employee raises a concern N=4

Although we check when the employee raises a concern, it is more often the supervisor who raises the concern.

No set schedule

Occasional reviews are initiated at the university level.

We do a comparison with ARL salary data about every 3–4 years. We ALSO solicit, \*every\* year, recommendations from the AULs about perceived equity imbalances in their divisions, and if the data show that it is truly the case, we try to make corrections for those to the extent possible within the salary pool.

#### **We don't make adjustments N=2**

Faculty was done. Staff was not (but supposed to be done by the university).

University does not normally address internal equity issues.

#### **Other N=5**

Employees are moving around the library to new positions through an "internal opportunity" process; position descriptions are reviewed when this occurs.

Librarians may apply for salary adjustments based, in part, on pay received by others in similar positions at the same institution. There is no formalized system for other employee groups.

Same answer as above. Any action is driven by campus HR for staff and by provost office for faculty and other academic personnel.

We typically review salaries at the point of filling a vacancy, for internal compression issues.

When funding is available and the inequity is documented through the campus salary survey, pay is adjusted.

**23. Which of the following compensation management challenges does your organization currently face? Check all that apply. N=44**

Inability to offer competitive merit increases	29	66%
Salaries not competitive with similar jobs external to the organization	23	52%
Salaries not equitable within the organization	18	41%
Other challenge	13	30%

**Please briefly describe the other challenge(s). N=13**

Compression

Cost of living in the region near the university

Inability for merit increases to reflect cost of living increases.

IT positions not competitive

Market data for newer positions

Perception of internal and external equity is an on-going challenge.

Salaries are low in light of the area's cost of living.

Salary compression

Salary freezes and budget cuts affect increases.

The second "salaries" option is true only for our IT employees.

The structure of our ranks for librarians and faculty status results in high-paid senior librarians doing regular work, and lower ranked faculty managing libraries and being paid less. We have an inequitable system but no way to fix this ourselves.

Unable to offer salary increases for excellent ongoing work.

Unsure where salaries are not competitive with similar jobs external to the organization.

## PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT

---

The purpose of this section is to learn more about the performance assessment practices your library uses.

**24. Please indicate how frequently each category of library employee receives a performance appraisal/evaluation. Please make one selection per row. N=51**

Category	Annually	Other frequency	N
Other professional staff	49	2	51
Library executive	40	11	51
Librarians	41	9	50

Category	Annually	Other frequency	N
Department/unit managers	42	8	50
Library support staff	49	1	50
Administrative management	46	4	50
Other staff category	5	2	7
Total Responses	50	17	51

**If you indicated above that an “Other staff category” is evaluated annually, please specify the category. N=4**

Graduate teaching assistants and graduate research assistants are required to have annual evaluations.

IT staff

Part-time employees

Student assistants

**If you selected “Other frequency” above, please specify the staff category and describe the frequency of appraisals. N=18**

Academic librarians are not reviewed after they receive tenure. We are unionized and there is no provision for post-tenure review in our contract.

All employees are evaluated annually. Department/unit managers are additionally reviewed at 3-year intervals. Senior leaders are additionally reviewed at 5-year intervals.

Annual frequency is recommended for all staff groups but implementation is irregular.

Bargaining unit staff are not evaluated beyond initial probation period.

Dean is evaluated very, very briefly each year, and then gets an in-depth evaluation about every 7–8 years as part of campus program reviews.

Dean is reviewed every five years.

Deans receive performance appraisal on 5-year cycle.

Faculty evaluations are done every two years prior to tenure, then every five years. There is no separate evaluation for department heads, who are faculty members.

Librarians and other professional staff (archivists and curators) holding tenure have biennial assessments; pre-tenured, contingent, and limited term have annual assessments. Department/unit managers who are academic staff holding administrative appointments are reviewed every five years if they wish to stand for reappointment.

Librarians are reviewed every three years.

Librarians are reviewed every two years at the assistant librarian and associate librarian ranks, and every three years at the full librarian rank. Department managers are reviewed on different schedules depending on whether they are staff or librarians.

Librarians in any role are reviewed every two years.

Librarians/department heads are reviewed biennially or triennially. AULs and UL are evaluated triennially.

Our university librarian and dean of libraries receives a review every five years.

Review cycles for librarians: Assistant and associate every two years, Full every three years

Reviews are conducted twice per year at six-month intervals.

The deans have a major review every five years.

The library executive (the dean) is reviewed formally every five years, with annual informal reviews

#### **Additional Comment N=1**

Professional staff and library executive receive annual performance reviews. Librarians receive reviews of their progress towards meeting the standard for tenure/promotion, but they are not performance reviews per se.

#### **25. Which of the following dimensions are assessed in library staff performance appraisals/ evaluations? Check all that apply. N=51**

Job functions	49	96%
Goals	49	96%
Project-based progress and contributions	45	88%
Competencies	37	73%
Other dimension	6	12%

#### **Please briefly describe the other dimension(s). N=6**

Leadership ability, contribution to a diverse workplace

Performance outcomes

Professional activity outside the library, university and public service, research and other creative activity

University core values are included in assessing the “how” someone performs.

While this may qualify as a job function, faculty are evaluated on research production. Untenured faculty are reviewed for retention yearly based on P&T criteria until their mandatory tenure review comes up after their probationary period.

Workplace behaviors

#### **26. Please briefly describe up to three challenges your library has had with performance assessment. N=47**

Assessments for faculty members may be done by individuals who are unfamiliar with the faculty member’s work. Some supervisors are behind on conducting assessments for non-faculty. Assessments are not tied to compensation, so they are viewed as being pro-forma in some cases.

Buy-in from managers who conduct evaluations—especially when they are not tied to merit increases. Performance assessment has been completed but could have been done much better. Inflation of performance assessment.



Central processing form (established by university) is somewhat rigid and restricting. Inconsistencies between evaluators. Lack of training in process of performance assessment.

Challenges with variation in scoring by supervisors. Staff positions are covered by collective bargaining agreements and compensation is not tied to performance. Overall challenge to tie merit increases to performance scores.

Consistency throughout library. SMART goal setting. Alignment of individual goals to organizational goals.

Developing consensus about performance rating levels. Creating an approach for faculty that integrates assessment of role-related performance and progress toward promotion and tenure.

Differentiating “professional service” (external and elective) from those tasks that are intrinsic to the librarian’s job—especially when so many “external” organizations (like our key consortia) have committees that behave somewhat like ALA committees. Staff believe that different supervisors rate inconsistently so that it is “easier” to get a high rating in some departments. Definitions for the ratings are not understood or applied consistently despite regular training.

Difficult to get supervisors to give constructive or negative feedback. Difficulty to get buy-in for the process when there are no raises for merit. For support staff, the mandated tool is not adequate.

Documenting who was responsible for positive outcomes and documenting when a person/unit does not contribute to a project. Inconsistent methodology by managers/supervisors. Outdated faculty measurement models. How to handle tenured librarians who don’t keep up with new advances in the profession. It is awkward to have many managers managing staff who don’t understand (e.g., new technology-cost of digital storage of the campus’ lack of a robust infrastructure) or new teaching methods.

Does not address changing priorities and goals throughout the year. Form is too long and takes too much time. Individual learning plans and career pathing are inadequate.

Doesn’t achieve any real purpose with performance. Not connected with merit. Does not affect promotion.

Evaluation instruments, though carefully re-designed, evaluate traits rather than performance. Provost level rejection of supervisor ratings. Lack of completion of evaluations by supervisors.

Failure by managers/supervisors to complete annual performance assessments for employees. Poorly completed reviews by managers/supervisors, i.e., lack of specific feedback for employees. Lack of SMART goals; lack of accountability.

Figuring out how to consistently describe the criteria for ‘meets expectations’.

Forms and procedures provided by university are inadequate. Employees fail to effectively conduct self-evaluation. Supervisors not adequately trained and evaluated on performance review skills.

Getting them done; annual reviews are not done consistently across the organization (even within the same employee group). Tendency of reviews to downplay performance problems, possibly to avoid confrontation or because reviewer not skilled in offering constructive criticism.

Grade inflation. Quantitative evaluation not aligned with qualitative evaluation. Introducing a self-assessment option.

Honest evaluations by supervisors. Ability to deal with and resolve performance concerns. Productive evaluation discussions between supervisors and employees.

Inability to mandate completion of annual appraisals—lack of support from highest level of management. Perception by supervisors that appraisal is not part of their responsibilities.

Inconsistencies of performance evaluation’s key responsibilities. Evaluations have been paper form, are converting to electronic version.

## Inflation of results

Leniency/rating inflation. Willingness of managers to confront performance issues when they arise.

Librarians are not evaluated every year. Performance evaluations are not on a number scale and leads to vague reviews. Inconsistent scoring.

Managers' reluctance to provide critical assessment. Employees' failure to recognize performance level required. Lack of understanding about goal setting.

Merit programs are either minuscule or absent, and they do not truly reward high performers. Managers do not provide year-round feedback. Employees do not want to hear truthful feedback.

No post-tenure review of academics is provided for in the union contract.

Norming across units. Rating inflation, particularly with long-term employees. New staff performance management tool was implemented without much implementation lead time or support.

Not all employees are subject to it (i.e., librarians, library paraprofessionals). Merit pay for faculty is not based on job performance; it is based primarily on research outputs. Faculty feel they are "above" having a performance assessment; it's their right to not be judged.

Providing meaningful & specific feedback on ways performance has been good and ways in which it might improve. Following up on improvement efforts. Making certain that employees won't be surprised by what they find in the formal assessment.

Rankings applied consistently across entire organization. Large time commitment required of managers to do a proper job of this.

Rating/grade inflation. Inability to reward performance due to lack of merit funding or bargaining agreements. Timely submission.

Ratings inflation. Employee morale when evaluation is based in numerical ratings. Inconsistency from supervisor to supervisor, particularly when trying to recalibrate the ratings across the library.

Required time commitment.

State mandate pay-for-performance system, with no pay increase.

Still a paper process. Large number of high ratings. Consistent practice and tie to strategic plans.

Supervisor discomfort with constructive feedback. Passing underperformers. Lack of self-awareness/competencies in some staff.

Supervisors being truthful in their evaluations to the employees. Support staff not setting goals because that would have them doing work outside their job classification. Getting the process completed in a timely manner.

Supervisors waiting until the annual performance assessment before giving negative or positive feedback to employee. Supervisors not recognizing that poor attendance equates to poor performance. Supervisors who cannot handle what they see as confrontation when they should be giving employee negative feedback.

Tenuous connection between assessment and raises. Changing rules for tenure track faculty assessment. Numerous forms, processes, and schedules for review for various staff families.

The online system. Fair calibration of merit. Supervisors unwilling to have difficult conversations with employees.

Three staff groups with three performance assessment processes and timelines. Many long-term employees in the support staff group are at the top of their job scales; not many opportunities for promotion.

Time consuming. Making sure all supervisors and employees see this as an opportunity.

Time consuming. Consistent application of performance ratings across libraries/departments.

Time consuming. Due at a busy time of year. Inflated ratings and not really dealing effectively with performance issues.

Timely completion by supervisors for classified employees.

Timely submission of reviews. Developing appropriate annual goals.

Understanding and equitable applications of rankings. Timing.

---

## COMPETENCIES

The purpose of this section is to discover if your library uses competencies for talent management related systems and programming. For this section, a competency is defined as a behavior, skill, or attribute an individual needs to be successful in his/her job. Competencies focus on how an employee does their job, not what they do (i.e., functional responsibilities).

### 27. Has your library identified competencies for its employees? N=50

Yes	31	62%
No	19	38%

**If no, please briefly explain why your library doesn't use competencies. Then continue to the next screen. N=14**

Have long incorporated competencies into the career path for librarians, less often with other positions.

It hasn't been the highest priority.

It is not part of the performance evaluation systems used by the campus.

Librarians do not like to be categorized in any way, so that they can be compared.

Library has wanted to shorten the process.

Necessity for collective bargaining on these issues makes it difficult.

The university system is working to establish core competencies so it is not the right time to establish library specific competencies.

These have been used on an ad hoc basis. We have not coordinated practices or required their use.

This hasn't been an issue of concern.

Under development

We are exploring options for pursuing this in FY15; some departments and positions have established competencies, but there is not yet an institutional approach.

We do, but we have not organized our approach into a competency-based system. Needs some time and attention from library human resources and others.

We have not yet developed the model, but we are currently investigating.

While we do use general campus-wide competencies during job interviews and training, we have not developed organization or position-specific competency models. Performance is measured through outcomes rather than against particular competencies.

**Answered Yes N=2**

The university has defined organizational competencies for staff and academic professional positions. This doesn't include faculty librarians.

We have competencies for librarians, and for professional staff, not for paraprofessionals.

**If yes, please answer the following questions.**

**28. Please briefly describe how competencies are aligned with your organizational strategy. N=24**

Academic staff (Librarians and Other Professional Staff): competencies not formally identified. Administrative management staff: five core leadership competencies used campus-wide. Library support staff: eight core competencies used campus-wide.

Among the actions identified in the library's strategic plan is to "create a systematic employee development and training plan, including foundation skills and core competencies." To date, emphasis has been on core competencies for support staff in public service roles.

As positions turn over the line is assessed for the necessary skills that a revised/new position requires. Each employee has a professional development plan with competencies required to meet the goals of the organization.

By defining behaviors that are essential for the university to achieve its strategic goals.

Competencies are drawn from the organization's strategic directions and are used in recruiting, performance management, and professional development planning.

Competencies are identified by the university. We chose from a pre-populated list based on position.

Competencies are reviewed at the time of turnover and when we create new positions.

Competencies are used for all staff positions university-wide for job classification purposes. Competencies have not been broadly identified for faculty positions. The competencies for staff have not been strongly aligned with strategy.

Currently, everyone is expected to embody the university's core values of integrity, excellence in leadership, excellence in mission, teamwork, and accountability. For leadership roles, additional competencies have been identified by the university, which we use in evaluating those in leadership roles.

Customer service competencies create results not only for students and other users of library space, resources, and services but also for our "internal customers." Change management, teamwork, and collaboration involve understanding how your job relates to the organization, working well with others from diverse backgrounds, helping to achieve mutual and independent goals, and communicating productively about change. Problem solving and judgment are key to accomplishing both operational and strategic goals.

Each duty and responsibility in an employee's position description has a corresponding work standard that is used to measure how successful employees are in their job.

For librarians/professional staff, competencies articulate “soft skills” that are necessary for success in the organization  
 For support staff, competencies are defined by job profile at the state-wide level. We interpret and apply those competencies to support our organizational goals and strategies.

In user services areas, and there are a couple institution wide on the annual performance review.

Our librarian competencies provide guidance to librarians in their development.

Required competencies are included in each job description.

Staff competencies are reflected in job descriptions. Job descriptions are reviewed and if necessary revised on an annual basis to reflect changes in roles and responsibilities. Roles and responsibilities are reviewed and revised to reflect continuation or changes in the Libraries’ organizational strategies or university changes and/or initiatives.

Support staff competencies are set at the university level and adjusted at the library for local conditions.

The libraries use one performance evaluation for all staff. This includes evaluating the following categories: customer focus, problem solving, accountability, service excellence, respect for others, and continuous improvement. These categories directly align with our organizational strategy.

They align with values of the organization.

They are not.

This is still a work in progress. We have identified a multi-section chart of competencies and are gradually trying to designate within each group of skills which ones are of strategic importance (aligned with particular goals in our plan), and which ones are operationally important (i.e., needed just to keep our daily business going).

Through the annual performance evaluation process

We have a well-documented set of staff (non-librarian) competencies that align with the organizational strategy because they were born from an in-depth analysis of staff position descriptions. We are in the process of developing strategic objectives for the next five years. Once done we will re-assess competencies.

We’ve recently developed competencies for public services staff that reflect our library’s move towards more combined service desks.

**29. Please indicate whether your library used any of the competency models below when creating your library’s competencies. Check all that apply. N=18**

Core Competencies for Librarianship—American Library Association	5	28%
Competencies for Research Librarians —Association of Southeast Research Libraries (ASERL)	2	11%
Standards for Proficiencies for Instruction Librarians and Coordinators—Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL)	2	11%
Professional Competencies for Reference and User Services Librarians —ALA’s Reference and User Services Association	2	11%
Competencies for Special Collections Professionals—Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL)	1	6%
Competencies of Law Librarianship—American Association of Law Libraries	1	6%
Proprietary competencies (e.g., Lominger, DDI)	1	6%
Map, GIS and Cataloging/Metadata Librarian Core Competencies—ALA’s Map and Geography Round Table (MAGERT)	0	—

Core Competencies for Electronic Resources Librarians —North American Serials Interest Group (NASIG)	0	—
Core Competencies for Art Information Professionals—Art Libraries Society of North America (ARLIS/NA)	0	—
Core Competencies and Music Librarians—Music Library Association	0	—
Other competency model	13	72%

**Please specify the other competency model(s). N=13**

ALA-APA Library Support Staff Certification Competency Sets; Webjunction competency index; Connecticut Library Association Support Staff Competencies; NC State Library Tech Competencies; State Library of Iowa Staff Competencies; Syracuse University-Exempt & Non-Exempt Staff Competency Library

All our staff are expected to meet three universal competencies identified at the campus level, e.g., civility, commitment to diversity.

Competencies chose by university competency model.

Core Competencies for 21st Century CARL Librarians (Canadian Association of Research Libraries, 2010)

Developed our own.

For non-faculty positions the library uses university-defined organizational competencies.

Internal (2 responses)

Model developed by IMLS in their “21st Century Librarians” projects.

REviews current practices for Libraries IT managers.

Set by university and state human resources.

This answer is limited to competencies for public services support staff, the only recent system-wide review of competencies. A major goal of the project was to coordinate competencies with our institution’s benchmarking in language appropriate to union contracts. In this context, the most valuable competencies lists were non-public documents shared by other institutions working in a similar labor context.

We have developed and refined our competencies largely in consultation with campus human resources specialists, with a focus on competencies that cut across all job classifications in the library, including library faculty, professional staff, and support staff.

**30. Please check all the ways in which your library uses competencies. N=32**

Position descriptions/job profiles for existing employees	23	72%
Performance appraisals/evaluations	23	72%
Training	21	66%
Job postings for recruitments	20	63%
Job interviews	20	63%
Development plans	19	59%
Leadership development	14	44%
Other purpose	1	3%

Please briefly describe the other purpose(s). N=1

Job classification and pay grades

**31. Please briefly describe up to three critical competencies your employees need to possess in order for your library to successfully meet its goals and strategies. N=31**

Ability to articulate the foundations of the profession, i.e., ethics, values, and principles of librarianship. Ability to articulate concepts and issues and methods related to management of knowledge resources. Proficiency with communication, information, and related technologies as they affect resources, service delivery, and use of the library.

Ability to change and adapt. Communications. Technical/digital skills.

Ability to cope with change, flexible/adaptable. Interpersonal communication skills, people skills. Responsibility, leadership, problem solving, owning work that relates to service area.

Ability to seek solutions. Collaborative/emotionally intelligent. Flexibility.

Ability to work creatively, collaboratively, and effectively, both as a team member and independently. Capacity to thrive in an innovative, ambiguous, future-oriented environment and respond effectively to changing needs and priorities. Outstanding written and oral communication skills, interpersonal skills, and ability to provide exceptional service to a diverse clientele.

Assessment

Collaboration. Communication. Flexibility.

Communication. Collaboration. Respect and civility.

Communication effectiveness. Ability to work with others. Innovation.

Communication skills. Teamwork skills. Motivation.

Customer focus. Integrity and trust. Diversity.

Customer focus. Service excellence. Continuous improvement.

Customer service. Change management/teamwork/collaboration. Problem solving and judgment.

Effective oral and written communication skills. Ability to work in a collaborative environment. Ability to apply technical skills and knowledge to support university activities.

Envision the future. Engage and support others. Focus on results.

Excellent customer service skills to meet the needs of students, faculty and the community. Commitment to service to the university and the University Libraries. Commitment to professional development.

Flexibility. Teamwork. Innovation.

Flexibility. Change management.

Flexibility. Self-awareness. Organizational acumen.

Innovation and quality. Deep subject/process/technical expertise. Collaboration and teamwork.

IT skills and people and communication skills. A combination of IT and library awareness. I find that older IT staff don't use the library catalog and website in the way that faculty and students do. IT personnel need to understand each department in the library and how instruction and research have changed in the last five years. Problem solving/decision making. Accountability. Communication and interpersonal skills.

Job specific or subject matter expertise required to be successful. Collaboration skills. Communication skills.

Leadership. How to run meetings. Project management 101.

Leadership. Collaboration and networking. Interpersonal skills.

Manage continuous change. Manage multiple responsibilities. Manage to learn new technologies.

Motivation and willingness to proactively engage with faculty, students, and administrators. Ability to instruct users on the fly about library resources and services. Ability to match user needs with resources on the campus.

Outstanding communication skills. Willingness to learn, adapt, and change. Outstanding interpersonal skills.

Personal accountability. Teamwork and collaboration. Flexible.

Subject expertise. Technical expertise. Strong communication and interpersonal skills.

Team building and project management. Digital design and digital content management. External communication and service quality.

Teamwork: Implies the intention to work cooperatively with others, to be a part of a team, to work together, as opposed to working separately or competitively. Adaptability & Flexibility: Is the ability to adapt to and work effectively within a variety of situations, and with various individuals or groups. Job Knowledge & Technical Competence: How well does the employee demonstrate sufficient understanding and proficiency in the technical, managerial, and organization aspects of the job?

## PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

---

The purpose of this section is to learn more about the type of development opportunities your library provides to its employees.

### 32. What types of professional development opportunities are available to employees within your library? Check all that apply. N=50

Travel funds	48	96%
Library-wide training offerings	47	94%
Individual training funds	41	82%
Experience-based development (i.e., on-the-job experience)	36	72%
Leadership development program	33	66%
Customized development plans	16	32%
Other opportunity	7	14%

### Please briefly describe the other professional development opportunity. N=7

10% release time for self-directed research activities for librarians. Faculty receive professional development leaves like sabbaticals. All staff may apply for research funding. Conference attendance funding.



Campus HR offers many courses appropriate for professional development.

Campus training offerings in a wide range of managerial and technical skills. The leadership programs indicated above are programs run by the university.

Department/unit heads allocated training budgets based on number of staff. Professional Expense Reimbursement for academic staff (\$1500 annually).

Individual training funds apply to faculty and academic professional positions. Although the library doesn't have an internal leadership development program, the library sends employees to outside programs and institutes. The library also offers library-wide training on a periodic basis. The university training and organizational development offers training that all employees can attend as well.

Professional development speaker series on hot topics

The university often offers subsidized registration for employees for conferences it creates and markets to a wide audience, e.g., an annual conference for pre-tenure women.

**33. Please indicate which positions within your library have which type of customized development plans. Check all that apply. N=35**

Plan	Librarians	Other professional staff	Department/unit managers	Library support staff	Administrative management	Library executive	Other staff category	N
Training plans (used to help employees learn a new task, job, technology, process etc.)	22	23	20	25	10	8	3	28
Leadership development plans (used when preparing individuals for future leadership roles or to improve leadership skills in current job)	20	14	17	4	10	9	0	21
Competency-based development plans (used when individuals identify competencies they would like or need to develop)	13	14	12	15	11	7	3	18
Career/professional development plans (used to help individuals plan for a future career move)	14	11	11	8	8	5	1	16
Other type of plan	1	2	2	1	2	0	0	2
Total Responses	29	29	28	29	22	15	4	35

If you selected “Other staff category” above, please specify the category and type of plan. N=2

For Libraries IT staff and faculty targeted training is funded.

Graduate assistants and interns: career development and training plans

If you selected “Other type of plan” above, please specify which staff category and briefly describe the plan. N=3

Individual development plans are optional at our organization, but some program areas do use them.

Non-exempt support staff and exempt professional staff use a Staff Development Plan Guidebook developed for the Libraries by campus HR. Staff member and supervisor discuss and make notes re: job assessment, career readiness assessment, and the development plan for the year.

We outline customized development plans when a person is newly appointed to a job and we want to lay out a trajectory for how and when they will gain specific competencies needed (which of course depends on which ones they already have for that exact job).

34. Which type(s) of development plan(s) has/have been most successful? Check all that apply. N=33

Training plans (used to help employees learn a new task, job, technology, process etc.)	25	76%
Leadership development plans (used when preparing individuals for future leadership roles or to improve leadership skills in current job)	14	42%
Competency-based development plans (used when individuals identify competencies they would like or need to develop)	12	36%
Career/professional development plans (used to help individuals plan for a future career move)	11	33%
Other type of plan	0	—

Comments N=6

A large proportion of our librarians and exempt staff have attended leadership development programs and have had the opportunity to develop leadership development plans.

The opportunity to use the skills on the job following training is very important.

The university performance management process includes annual individual development plans that managers can elect to complete with staff. These can be based on competencies or specific goals. Completion of these plans is not required by the library but encouraged.

We are in the first year of using a structured development plan approach for non-exempt support staff and exempt professional staff.

We have just created a Leadership Development Program for “high potentials” and will kick-off the program in August.

We have no data on which to base this. My perception is that it depends more on the individual than the type of plan.

## LEADERSHIP AND SUCCESSION PLANNING

---

The purpose of this section is to learn more about the types of leadership and succession planning strategies your library uses.

### 35. Does your library have a leadership development program? N=49

Yes	17	35%
No	32	65%

If no, please briefly describe why your library doesn't have a leadership development program.

N=17

Although we don't have an individual development program, the library supports attendance at external programs and institutes as mentioned in previous questions.

In the process of developing a leadership program.

It is something that is currently under discussion, but does not exist now.

Leaders are developed based on performance, interest, and need.

Leadership development has been on an individualized basis, not part of a comprehensive plan.

No infrastructure or staff time assigned to this.

Participate in campus-wide initiatives.

Rely on external programs.

The library doesn't have one, but the university does and has had library staff enrolled. In addition, TRLN has a type of management development program. The library also supports participation in discipline specific leadership development programs such as ARL, Harvard, and EDUCAUSE.

The library faculty council has never supported one outside of a mentor program that has little to no success.

There is one on campus; and we constantly keep leadership development in mind, but informally, for librarians and department heads.

University has a leadership development program.

Use external programs.

We are currently creating a leadership development program.

We do not have a formal leadership development program. However, we identify high potential employees and provide them with internal opportunities for leadership experience as well as internal and external training.

We have several leadership development strategies, not formally defined as a "program."

We occasionally have programs within the library, but they have a beginning and end. We do not have an ongoing leadership development program, although we are beginning to plan one based on a successful program we had a few years ago.

**36. Does your library identify high potential (HIPO) employees within the organization? N=47**

Yes	22	47%
No	25	53%

**If yes, how do you use this designation? Check all that apply. N=22**

Leadership development	17	77%
Succession planning	9	41%
Compensation adjustment	7	32%
Other purpose	5	23%

**Please briefly describe the other purpose. N=5**

In determining assignments/opportunities

Ongoing

Priority for retention

Provide support for professional development and internal advancement.

We don't do a formal designation but the senior administration of the library regularly refers to various employees who we can see have high potential and who we want to develop and retain (and use to help move our whole organization along).

**If no, please briefly describe why your library doesn't identify high potential employees. N=16**

Although we don't have a formal process to identify high potential employees, the library does support talented faculty and staff through external development opportunities and assignments to enhance experience.

Doing so does not conform to the unique framework and special requirements of the federal hiring process.

High potential employee identification is done informally; there is no designation for it.

Informally accomplished, concerns over fairness and adverse morale for those not picked.

It does happen, but not part of a comprehensive plan.

It has not historically been part of the strategic direction.

No formal process in place

No formal process; may happen informally within departments and units.

Open competition for leadership positions

There are individuals who are known to have high potential, but we have never designated them as such in any formal way.

They are identified, but not in a standardized system-wide process.

We do not have a formal way to do this. We do recognize exceptional talent and find opportunities for development for those individuals.

We do this on a more informal basis. As leadership opportunities arise the management team will suggest possible candidates.

We don't overtly identify these individuals and make it known, however the senior leadership does identify individuals as those potential to move into management/leadership roles.

We have not yet taken the opportunity to formalize a program that would have value.

We try to apply opportunities to all interested staff. For HIPO employees, the opportunities may be greater and more frequent, however.

**37. How does your library typically hire senior/executive management positions (i.e., Director/ University Librarian/Dean, Associate Director/Associate University Librarians, or Assistant Directors/ Assistant University Librarians)? N=50**

Mostly hire from within our organization	12	24%
Mostly hire from outside our organization	25	50%
Other	13	26%

**Comments N=13**

A mix of both. Post re-org we filled our new Program Director roles internally, after one year we had an opening for one of the PD roles, which we recently filled externally.

Actually, we hire from both within and outside our organization. We are looking for the most qualified candidate.

Anticipate that there will be more hiring from outside in order to get skills and expertise not currently held.

At the associate UL level, searches are internal first, and only go external if unsuccessful at the internal level. At the UL level, the internal and external search is simultaneous with internal candidates having some advantage.

Both (2 responses)

Both. Deans are hired mostly from outside the organization, Associate Deans and Directors from inside.

Combination of both

Equally from within and from outside

For these positions, the typical pattern is to do a national search. In most, but not all, cases, hires have been from within the organization.

Have not had any positions in the last three years.

It depends on the position; supportive of internal hire for senior positions, but with a limited pool often go outside.

It is a mix; there may be people internal that are suitable, and if not, then we recruit externally.

It is about 50/50, based upon merit of both internal and external candidates.

Mixture of internal and external hires. We conduct national searches and select the best candidates, regardless of internal/external status.

Most positions from within, but not the director

Only one opportunity to hire in the past five years, hired from outside.

Practices differ depending on position: AULs are frequently hired from within, but the university librarian is most often an external hire.

We conduct national searches. If the best qualified is an internal applicant, we'll hire that person.

We currently hire a mix of employees from within and outside of our organization.

We hire both within and outside of our organization in conformance with the federal hiring process and based on the strengths of the individual candidates and the needs of the position.

We hire from within and without the organization.

**38. If your library tends to hire mostly from within your organization, please briefly describe the rationale for using that strategy. N=13**

Internal employees interview everyday.

Not a specific strategy, just the way it worked out.

Talented staff who know the university and are motivated to make the library the best possible organization.

Tend to try to fill internally for section head and department head positions when available pool.

The dean hires/appoints the associate deans, so it occurs within the library. Associate deans tend to be oriented more toward operations making knowledge of local practices and institutional history beneficial. It lends continuity. Also provides a promotion opportunity for leadership development within. Often they have been groomed to move into senior leadership.

The majority of the senior positions are administrative appointments (five-year term) assigned to current academic staff.

There is not a specific strategy to do this.

Too key to rely on selection of unknown people, time required to become effective and tenure on hire is too risky.

University policy

We encourage internal applications, but we conduct open searches in order to attract a diverse pool. We hire the best-qualified candidate, whether internal or external.

We have had a number of reorganizations in which high potential staff have been able to take on additional responsibilities.

We look first to see if there are suitable internal candidates, as a way to grow leadership from within. Internal candidates have a solid knowledge base of the library's operations and culture to be successful.

We use a mix of internal opportunity for those who are interested in learning new skills.

**39. If your library tends to hire mostly from outside your organization, please briefly describe the rationale for using that strategy. N=23**

Always looking to hire the best candidate whether they are internal or external to our organization.

At the dean's discretion

If we do not have the requisite expertise internally, then we hire from the outside. Typically for the executive positions (Dean, Associate Dean), those are international competitions and our last two searches for these roles have brought in external candidates.

It is not an explicit strategy. The searches are always open to all applicants. Sometimes we do not get internal candidates, but often we do. It is common at lower and mid-level searches that we do make internal promotions. At the higher levels we are often looking for new skill sets or experiences in certain kinds of projects and we are more likely to see that in external candidates.

Lack of qualified applicants from within

Leaders from the outside bring fresh perspective and new strengths.

Our practice is to conduct open searches for senior/executive management positions.

Our succession planning has revealed that while we currently have all of our leadership positions filled, if someone were to leave, we do not have the capacity to replace them and we would be looking to fill those roles externally in some cases.

The provost hires the dean. They are usually looking for new leadership from outside, often someone who brings experience as a dean at a smaller institution. Generally, they want someone with a PhD and that often is not available internally. The responsibilities of a dean usually include fundraising and development activities and few internal candidates, unless they have served for a significant period of time as an interim dean, have that experience.

The rationale for using this strategy is to bring in senior managers who have skill sets that may not be resident in the organization as well as a new perspective on work, strategic initiatives, and library services.

There is a limited pool of staff and often not qualified candidates at that level internally.

Two AULs were appointed; three AULs and UL were recruited.

Unknown outside candidates have less local baggage.

Value outside experience to broaden and enrich organization.

We are committed to the fresh vision and perspective that comes from hiring outside the organization.

We conduct national recruitments and select the individual that is best qualified and competitive for the position. The majority of new hires at this level have been external, but not exclusively.

We do not have a formalized library leadership development program.

We have had a change in direction and leadership. Skill sets needed were not available within the organization.

We have only recently begun to hire from outside the organization. It isn't a specific strategy. The two most recent hires were the best qualified and came from outside.

We mostly hire entry-level librarian from outside our organization, but promote into managerial positions from within. We hire entry-level librarians from the outside to infuse new ideas, practices, procedures, etc., into our organization. Additionally, creating a more diverse workforce is a high priority within the University Libraries and the university.

We want to identify and hire the best-qualified person for the job, regardless of internal or external.

We want widest possible pool of talent and diversity.

When hiring for senior/executive management positions, we are seeking to bring in new talent with experience in cutting edge technologies, services, and programs.

**40. Does your library have a succession planning strategy (i.e., a deliberate plan to develop and prepare identified successors)? N=48**

Yes	9	19%
No	39	81%

**If no, please briefly describe why your library does not have a succession planning strategy. N=25**

Doing so does not conform to the unique framework and special requirements of the federal hiring process.

Have not made it a priority.

Ideally, the library would like to implement more of a succession planning strategy but haven't had the resources to formally develop a plan.

Identified successors means the person who will assume a position when it is vacated by the incumbent. Our positions are opened competitively. We do try to develop leadership capacity in employees, but we do not slot them into positions.

It has not been part of the current library administration's overall organizational strategy.

It is something we think about as we make plans, but it is not a formal strategy.

It's not as broad as a strategy, but we do take opportunities to promote identified successors when possible (three in the past year).

Lack of prospects and concerns over fairness and practicality

Nothing formal; some informal planning as resources and opportunities allow.

Our strategy is not as deliberate or focused as the question implies.

Our university requires open national searches. We cannot designate an heir-apparent. Our culture is to provide development opportunities to all who are interested to prepare them to qualify for potential opportunities, when they occur.

Planning to create a succession strategy

Succession planning occurs on an as needed basis.

That decision is up to the provost.

There is no deliberate system-wide plan in effect, but succession planning does happen at the unit level.

There is not a formal one; staff who could be considered as future leaders are identified and given the opportunity to develop the skills needed to become a qualified applicant for a future search.

There is not a plan along these lines at this time although we have talked about who among the staff might be a candidate for assuming a senior level position.

Under discussion



We do not have a formal succession planning strategy because succession planning is problematic in a public institution. We are, however, working on further defining our leadership planning.

We do succession planning for positions where we see both interest and potential that can be developed.

We have not yet had the opportunity to formalize such a strategy.

We haven't deliberately identified individuals to groom them for successor roles. However, through an annual assignment of duties process the dean is able to assign librarians into new roles or to have them shadow a leadership role.

We haven't discussed this at this point.

We informally do this but do not have a formal 'strategic plan' in place. Our former dean did include it in our strategic plan; our current dean who has been here three years does not. So I think it depends on your senior leadership in terms of choosing to include this in a libraries strategic plan.

When retirements happen we take the opportunity to review the position and determine if we want to fill it the same way. This includes management positions. Some of our unit libraries are getting smaller and smaller and thus the managerial responsibilities are shrinking. Management-wise, our library is becoming very flat. There are fewer opportunities for advancement to management and there are very little opportunities to gain management experience. This doesn't really explain why we don't have a succession plan, other than to say that it's hard to plan for succession when the positions might not exist in the future.

**41. Are managers in your library equipped with the skills necessary to provide employees leadership development opportunities that support a succession strategy? N=43**

Yes	26	61%
No	17	39%

**Comments N=13**

**Answered Yes N=7**

Among the most necessary skills are identification of leadership opportunities, a willingness to give employees these opportunities and to provide useful feedback. We encourage these skills in our managers, who possess them to varying degrees.

Managers identify some leadership development opportunities, while others are identified by senior/executive managers and recommended to the managers for consideration.

Most managers are.

Some but not all managers

The university offers support for successful transition.

This is an ongoing review process.

Yes, I think we now have that in place.

#### Answered No N=4

As resources allow, the library would like to implement for focused efforts around management development.

Middle managers are not. But senior administration is equipped to do so and after it is the middle managers who are being prepared.

No, but given the small pool of candidates in recent senior level positions, we are developing the skills internally.

Our managers need more coaching and encouragement in this area.

#### Additional Comments N=2

Somewhat

Yes and no—some are, others we are working with to build those skills.

## DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

---

The purpose of this section is to learn more about some of the characteristics of the libraries that complete the survey.

### 42. Are any library employees unionized? N=49

Yes	26	53%
No	23	47%

#### If yes, please briefly describe which staff categories are unionized. N=23

Administrative/library assistant, technical service (building maintenance workers, security officers), librarians

All categories are unionized save senior management and IT professionals.

All except dean, associate deans, and academic/professionals. The academic/professionals are in the process of unionizing.

Both librarians and library support staff are members of a union that includes university wide professional employees.

Civil service (clerical workers and library technicians/assistants); Administrative, Professional, and Technical; faculty (librarians)

Classified librarians

Clerical employees

Clerical staff

Everyone except the dean is a member of a union.

Librarians

Librarians (UC-AFT) and support staff (UPTE, TEAMSTERS LOCAL 2010, AFCSME)

Librarians and Other Professional Staff (Archivists and Curators) belong to the Faculty Association. Library staff belong to a union for public employees. Administrative management staff are not unionized.

Librarians, library assistants, administrative assistants

Librarians, paraprofessionals, and professional staff

Most staff and faculty positions are unionized. The majority of staff positions are in the clerical and administrative unit but there are several bargaining units covering library employees. The faculty librarians are also unionized and have two separate bargaining units for the tenure system and non-tenure system.

Non-supervisory librarians and most non-supervisory support staff

Our faculty and our classified employees are unionized.

Support staff

Support staff (library assistants), librarians, heads of libraries/units

Support staff are unionized. Librarians are part of the faculty association.

Support/paraprofessional staff

Tenure track faculty union and non-tenure track faculty union

There is a small group of classroom support technicians that report to the Libraries that are unionized. However, they do not perform typical library work.

43. Please indicate whether librarians and other professional staff have faculty status commensurate with teaching faculty or a parallel status, sometimes referred to as academic status, professional status, librarian rank, or something similar. Please make one selection per row. N=43

Category	Faculty status	Parallel status	N
Librarians	19	24	43
Other professional staff	1	13	14
Total Responses	19	29	43

**Comments N=14**

Librarians: Academic Status

Librarian rank and permanent status

Librarians and other professionals are represented by the campus staff association.

Librarians do not have faculty status, but are part of the faculty association (union).

Librarians have a similar process for promotion, but are not considered faculty per se. They are considered high-level professional employees within the university.

Most of our MLS/MIS holders and some with other degrees are in faculty positions. Our professional staff includes some MLS/MIS holders and many with other degrees.

Neither option is appropriate for our other professional staff. The only similarity to faculty status held by librarians is that they are exempt employed.

Other professional staff are treated as exempt staff without academic status.

Other professional staff includes archivists and curators.

Our librarians and other professional staff are on annual renewable appointments and do not have faculty or parallel status. We are in the process of implementing a ranking system.

Our librarians have faculty status with rank, no tenure.

Professional staff (i.e., HR, OD, Finance, IT) do not have faculty status.

Professional staff are not consider academic so they have no rank of any kind. They are classified in job levels and have exempt status. Some of them are Executive/Administrative class, but this is not parallel to anything on the academic side.

We have just introduced Academic Staff, which are faculty-equivalent.

44. Please indicate whether librarians and other professional staff are eligible for tenure commensurate with teaching faculty or a parallel status, sometimes referred to as continuing appointment, or are appointed for a specific period of time (e.g., 3 or 5 years). Please make one selection per row. N=43

Category	Tenure	Continuing appointment	Time-specific appointment	N
Librarians	19	16	7	42
Other professional staff	3	18	5	26
Total Responses	20	28	11	43

#### Comments N=13

Librarians: Appointment renewed annually.

Because our professional staff are not academic employees they do not meet any of the above selections.

Following successful completion of a one-year probationary period, both have continuing appointments.

Librarians appointments are for one-year terms.

Librarians are at-will employees generally. At the Law Center they can be contracted for up to three years.

Most of our MLS/MIS holders and some with other degrees are in faculty positions; these positions are tenure track. Our professional staff includes some MLS/MIS holders and many with other degrees; these positions are continuing appointment. We also have some professional staff on limited-term appointments.

None of the above. Librarians do not have tenure or continuing employment. They are "at will" employees, but it is \*not\* time-specific or limited.

Note: depending on their category, some "other professionals" are at-will and some have permanent status.

Other appointments can be either continuing or time-specific.

Other professional staff are treated as exempt staff without academic status.

Other professional staff includes archivists and curators.

See previous comment. While “tenure” was marked, it is known as “continuing faculty status” for all faculty, not just librarians.

The library has tenure and non-tenure system faculty. Non-tenure system faculty and academic professional staff are appointed on an annual basis. The non-tenure system faculty can include visiting appointments, which are generally one-year appointments that can be renewed for up to three years.

**45. Please indicate how the number of library employees has changed in the last five years. Please make one selection per row. N=50**

Category	Increased	Decreased	Stayed about the same	N
Librarians	14	18	18	50
Library support staff	3	42	5	50
Other professional staff	24	12	13	49
Administrative management	10	12	27	49
Department/unit managers	0	23	24	47
Library executive	8	9	29	46
Other staff category	1	0	1	2
Total Responses	35	46	43	50

**If you selected “Other staff category” above, please specify the category. N=2**

Graduate Teaching Assistants (GTA) and Graduate Research Assistants (GRA) have stayed about the same.

Temporary appointments have increased the numbers of staff in all categories.

**Comments N=4**

Most significant growth is in Special Collections and technology-related positions.

Our FTE of student assistants has increased significantly.

We had 10 retirements last year as part of a university “voluntary separation” program. The positions are being held vacant during the payout period and the libraries will only receive 60–75% of the salary from those lines. Depending on how positions are filled, we could end up with fewer positions on a permanent basis.

With the 2012 reorganization we moved from four divisions to two, eliminating the need to replace two retiring AD’s. With the change in structure we moved from 34 department heads/managers to seven program directors, 11 managers, six supervisors.

---

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**46. Please enter any additional information that may assist the survey authors’ understanding of your library’s talent management efforts. N=7**

A couple years ago, we conducted a talent survey of staff. We used some of the results to appoint staff to teams or to involve them in activities in which they expressed some interest.

Our post-masters residency program is designed to be a pipeline for bringing new talent into the organization. We are part of a consortium that has developed a Management Academy that we offer to help develop management and business skills for mid-career professionals. We have established the position of Associate Head in all of our departments and branches to aid in the development of management skills and help with succession planning.

Our primary focus in recent years has been on recruitment and on helping junior faculty achieve promotion and tenure.

Talent management is a current priority for the campus so I'm confident our practices will change in the coming years.

The library has a strategic plan that includes eight initiatives. One of the initiatives is focused on talent management and employee engagement: Foster an engaged, productive and diverse workforce to better serve the user. In the upcoming year, the library will be focusing on professional development as one of the initiatives that supports this strategic priority. The library also has a diversity committee with goals to support this priority.

This survey was completed by department directors for Libraries IT and Social Science. Our Libraries IT department needs to understand how the library is used by the campus and the public. Our librarians and staff need to be more knowledgeable about IT issues in order to understand why something is, or is not, feasible. Many don't appreciate that our campus infrastructure is lacking and think that LIT does not want to cooperate. Overall, better communication is necessary across the library.

We saw a significant decrease in staff levels from 2008–2010. Since that time our staffing levels have remained static. However, through natural attrition we have moved positions such that new hires are in less traditional roles, acknowledging the impact of digital rather than print collections.

## RESPONDING INSTITUTIONS

---

University at Albany, SUNY	University of Kentucky
University of Alberta	University of Louisville
Boston University	University of Manitoba
Brigham Young University	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
University of British Columbia	National Library of Medicine
University of Calgary	North Carolina State University
University of California, Irvine	Northwestern University
University of California, Los Angeles	University of Notre Dame
University of California, San Diego	Ohio University
University of California, Santa Barbara	University of Oregon
University of Chicago	University of Pennsylvania
University of Colorado at Boulder	Pennsylvania State University
Colorado State University	Purdue University
University of Connecticut	Rutgers University
Dartmouth College	University of Saskatchewan
Duke University	Southern Illinois University Carbondale
University of Florida	Syracuse University
Georgetown University	Temple University
University of Georgia	University of Tennessee
University of Hawaii at Manoa	University of Texas at Austin
University of Illinois at Chicago	Vanderbilt University
Indiana University Bloomington	University of Virginia
University of Iowa	Virginia Tech
Iowa State University	Washington University in St. Louis
Johns Hopkins University	University of Waterloo
University of Kansas	University of Wisconsin—Madison
Kent State University	

