

Survey Results

Executive Summary

Introduction

A SPEC survey on library development was previously conducted in 2006 ([SPEC Kit 297: Library Development](#)), but that was prior to the Great Recession that lasted from 2007 to 2009. During that period, public university budgets eroded dramatically with a decline in state support. Both public and private institutions were impacted by the drop in endowment values and reduced donor support. Following the recession, fundraising continued to be a challenge, but as the recovery persisted, outcomes improved. Given the importance of library development and the continuing change in higher education and research libraries, this topic needed to be revisited.

This survey retained some elements of the 2006 study for longitudinal comparison of the pre-recession environment and the current, post-recession environment, and included new elements to more broadly depict the current role of library development, including friendraising (efforts intended to generate committed and supportive relationships with outside parties and entities), communication to stakeholders of library value added, and stories and/or descriptive measures provided in these communication efforts. The survey also examined the role of advisory boards in the fundraising process. Since many academic libraries are either currently or soon will be engaged in a capital campaign or the renovation of an old or construction of a new library, the survey also examined the complexities of these common endeavors.

The survey was conducted between March 2 and 29, 2018. Sixty of the 125 ARL member libraries responded to the survey for a 48% response rate. While participation was significantly lower than the 73% rate of the 2006 survey, respondents to this survey come from a broad cross section of the ARL university libraries. Forty-six libraries responded to both surveys.

Background

The development programs in the responding institutions represent a robust mix of initiatives and activities. The survey asked which of seven components are a part of the library's development program. A majority of the 59 respondents indicated that their program had all seven components. Of particular note, 93% indicated that a fundraising professional is assigned to the library, 90% use direct mailings, and 71% raise more than \$500,000 annually. Somewhat surprisingly, only 51% engage with a friends organization. The most common additional activity of note is event planning and support.

The date of select milestones among development programs is fairly well distributed. The date of hire for the first chief library development officer (LDO) is somewhat well distributed between 1980 and the present with a particular spike during 1990–2004, when 23 of the 42 responding institutions appointed their first chief LDO. The earliest reported friends group was founded in 1920. Since then the

start date for friends groups is well distributed with a 20-year period representing a noticeable spike. During 1980–1999, 10 of the 29 responding institutions started their friends group. The earliest reported library development board was formed in 1965. The start dates of development boards are noteworthy for their even distribution with one exception. From 1995–1999, no responding library started a development board. One library reached the \$500,000 annual fundraising goal in 1925. Then there is a gap until 1963. Interestingly, eight of the 35 respondents reached that goal during the period 2005–2009 that includes the great recession.

Library Donor Groups

Respondents were asked to indicate their level of access to various stakeholder groups. Either unlimited or limited/special project access were available options. Notable stakeholders with high levels of unrestricted access include active year and lapsed year library donors and both active and retired library employees. Stakeholders with particularly low unlimited access for respondents include university trustees, parents/grandparents of current students, and current students themselves. Respondents have more access to stakeholder groups for special projects and on other limited bases. Notable groups include current and lapsed year donors to other areas of the institution, people who have never given to the library, the Board of Trustees, current students, retired employees of the institution, and alumni.

Library Development Program Staffing

Fifty-two respondents answered a question about the number and FTE of fundraising professionals. They reported a total of 115 positions—77 full-time and 38 part-time—and just over 91 FTE. Twenty-two libraries have one fundraising professional and 15 have two. The 15 respondents who reported between three and 10 professionals raised the median number to two, which represents growth from 2006 when the median number was one. Twenty-six libraries (50%) have one fundraising professional dedicating 100% of his or her time to library development. Fifteen of these are at the 22 libraries that have only one development position. The single professionals at the other seven libraries spend between 20 and 50 percent of their time on development. At 15 of the 27 libraries that reported between two and four professionals, they all work full-time on development.

While there are many titles and reporting lines for the primary development professionals at the responding libraries, the most common title is some variation of “Director of Development” and the most common reporting line is to the dean/university librarian. For secondary fundraising professionals, there is some variation between the title of “Development Officer” and “Assistant Director of Development” and the most common reporting line is to the chief LDO. For those libraries with more than two positions, additional titles include various coordinator positions and administrative support with the majority reporting to the chief LDO.

Chief Library Development Officer

There is great variability among respondents in the term of service for the current chief LDO. The tenure for this position for the 48 respondents was from two weeks to 21 years. The mean for that tenure is 4.26 years with a standard deviation of 4.22 years and median is 3.00 years. The majority of chief LDOs (27 or 55%) served in another fundraising position in higher education, but outside of libraries just prior to their current position. There is also some variation among respondents regarding the organizational reporting for the chief LDO. At 23 libraries (46%) these positions are parallel to other department heads, 15 (30%) are parallel to AULs, and 12 (24%) are at another level of the organization. The education level of the chief LDO was sought as well. Of particular note, but not surprising, is the low number of MLS degrees among this cohort. Only five (10%) hold the MLS or equivalent, which represents a noticeable decline from 2006 when 19% of chief LDO’s held the MLS or equivalent.

Respondents were asked to estimate the percent of time that the chief LDO spends on various development activities. The majority of time is spent on major gifts. The threshold for a major gift is as little as \$10,000, but is most often \$25,000 or higher. Donor relations, special events, and annual giving also represent noticeable time commitments. Corporation and foundation relations and friends/board management were notable for representing relatively smaller percentages of the chief LDO's time.

Respondents were also asked to indicate by whom the library development goals are determined. There is great variation among these responses, but common responses include the central development or advancement office, the university librarian, or the chief LDO.

The Library Director's Role in Development

The majority of respondents (40 or 75%) reported that the library director is not required by the greater institution to spend a specified amount of time engaged in fundraising activities. This frequency is essentially unchanged from the data collected in 2006. Where there is a time requirement, it ranges from 20% to 100% and is most often under 50%, but clearly represents a significant investment of leadership effort. Notably, several 2018 respondents indicated that despite a lack of a specific requirement, other types of goals or an unofficially stated amount of time investment is expected for the director. The amount of time actually spent on development by library directors also varies considerably, from 2% to 100% of their time. Sixty-eight percent of directors spend less than one-third of their work time on development, 30% spend more than one-third of their work time on development. The average percentage of time spent by library directors is 36%.

Library directors typically become engaged in signing letters of correspondence, presenting proposals, closing gifts, meeting with prospects, and strategizing on prospects only after a specific financial threshold is met. While the average financial threshold, when one exists, for a signed letter of correspondence is somewhat modest, the average level of the required threshold for all of the other activities is well above \$50,000. In contrast, directors will commonly initiate telephone calls to prospects, regardless of financial level.

A comparison of the data collected in this survey to that collected in 2006 suggests some interesting shifts in the frequency of required financial thresholds for library director involvement. In 2018, these thresholds are much more commonly reported for director engagement in presenting proposals, gift closing, prospect strategy sessions, and, particularly, in meeting with prospects. The frequency of reporting a financial threshold for the latter has shown a 42% increase.

A sizeable majority of library directors (39 or 72%) participate in fundraising calls without the presence of development and fundraising personnel. This frequency is essentially unchanged from the data collected in 2006. The solo director engagement is often the result of established personal relationships with specific donors.

The University's Role in Library Development

There are substantial but uneven levels of active engagement by university leadership in fundraising for academic libraries. Fewer than half of chief academic officers (20 or 38%) or presidents (25 or 47%) are active in library fundraising. Unsurprisingly, their engagement is oriented to major or high-level donor prospects and commonly prompted by a request from the library.

Similarly, the majority of college deans (29 or 55%) are not actively engaged in supporting fundraising for the libraries. However, the majority of college or unit-level development officers (36 or 68%) are actively supportive. In some instances where active college dean support occurs, the libraries and colleges seem to have collaborative relationships for fundraising, and in other instances the college dean may simply make referrals of prospects when they determine they have an interest aligned with the library. The engagement with college development officers, based on comments from respondents,

often takes the form of joint proposals, and is a reflection of a campus culture that encourages cross-unit cooperation in fundraising. Many respondents also report active support from centralized (university-level) development personnel, including support associated with planned giving, prospect identification, stewardship, and annual giving.

Evaluating Library Development Staff

A wide range of metrics and measures are used in evaluating the performance of chief LDOs. At all but two of the 51 responding institutions, measures of dollars raised, visits, asks/proposals, and overall dollar goals are important or very important evaluation metrics. Measures of gift closures, visits per month or other period, and qualified donors are important or very important factors at all but ten institutions. For about half of these officers, the number of moves, pipeline reports, moves per month or other period, assisting other units, and joint proposals are important or very important for performance evaluation.

A comparison of the data collected in this survey to that collected in 2006 suggests some interesting shifts in the measures that are considered important or very important for evaluating chief LDOs. The relative order of the criteria is about the same—with dollars raised at the top of the list both times. In 2006, number of visits, number of asks, and overall dollar goal were the second, third, and fourth most important criteria. In 2018, they share second place and more than twice as many respondents identified them as important or very important. Gift closures and visits per month rose from fifth and sixth place to third and fourth place and almost three times as many respondents rated them as important or very important. All the other criteria were also more frequently rated important or very important in 2018, indicating a broader range of evaluation criteria now.

Most frequently, the evaluation of the chief LDOs is conducted jointly by the library director and a senior manager in university-level development (22 responses or 43%). At an equal number of institutions (14 or 28%) only the library director or personnel in the institution's development office conduct the evaluation. In one case, the dean of the College of Music and the AVC for Advancement conduct the evaluation jointly.

Thirty to 40 percent of the 46 respondents indicated a different set of criteria was used to evaluate other library development professionals. Fifteen to 30 percent rated the categories as not important. For the respondents who rated these criteria important or very important, dollars raised and overall dollar goal were the top two evaluation metrics (23 and 20 responses respectively). Number of visits, number of gift closures, and number of qualified donors tied for third place (19 or 41%). A comparison of the data sets for the two SPEC surveys shows that dollars raised stayed at the top of the list while the other criteria shifted positions slightly. About the same number of respondents rated the importance of these criteria in the evaluation of other library development professionals in 2018 and 2006, but the percentage who indicated the criteria are important overall is much higher in 2018.

At 71% of the responding institutions the chief LDO conducts the evaluation of the other library development professionals. In two cases the LDO and the library director are joint evaluators. In two other cases, someone from the institution's development office partners with the LDO. At six institutions management personnel in the institution's development office conduct the evaluation. At two libraries the library director is the sole evaluator. This frequency is comparable to the level from the data collected in 2006.

Evaluating Library Directors

Compared to the chief LDOs, the majority of respondents indicated that development outcome and activity metrics and measures are less commonly used in evaluating the performance of library directors. However, dollars raised and overall dollar goal are the top two criteria (40 and 34 responses respectively). Number of visits and number of qualified donors are a distant second tier of performance

evaluation factors (21 and 20 responses). A third tier includes number of gift closures, number of asks/proposals, visits per month or other period, and assisting other units (19, 17, 16, and 14 responses). Other performance measures reported for library directors include creating a culture for strategic fundraising within the library and multi-year or capital campaign outcomes.

Compared to the data collected in 2006, this survey suggests some interesting shifts in the measures that are considered important or very important for evaluating library directors. Dollars raised and overall dollar goal are the top two factors in both 2018 and 2006. Number of gift closures and number of asks/proposals were tied for a distant third place in 2006 and dropped to fifth and sixth place in 2018. Number of visits and number of qualified donors increased in importance as evaluation criteria in 2018, but number of moves dropped from fifth place in 2006 to tenth in 2018.

Library Coordination with the Institution's Development Office

More than half of the 2018 respondents (31 or 59%) reported that the library is not positioned or supported like other units, schools, or colleges within the institution in terms of fundraising opportunities. In 2006, fewer than half (37 or 47%) reported that was the case. Seven respondents who answered no in 2006 changed their answer to yes in 2018. On the other hand, nine who answered yes in 2006 now say that is no longer the case. Comments from this survey's respondents indicate other units have assigned development personnel and more development support staff. They also indicated the libraries do not have as many highly rated prospects and suffer from a lack of an alumni base.

Only on an occasional basis are most chief LDOs invited to participate in institutional-level meetings about major prospects. Most library directors are only occasionally invited to participate in institutional-level strategy meetings on fundraising. Both of these findings are comparable to levels reported in 2006.

The vast majority of respondents indicated the library was at least occasionally, if not always, included in institutional direct mail campaigns and phone-a-thons. Almost all of the respondents indicated the library was included in the institution-level fundraising website as a possible gift designation.

Library development staff and personnel from the institution's central development operations are engaged in numerous development-related activities. Most often, the library provides more significant funding level and staffing effort for special events, major gifts, and development communications. Central unit effort and funding is most often more significant for activities surrounding annual giving, direct mail, corporation and foundation relations, deferred or planned giving, information technology, gift processing, prospect research, records processing, and conducting phone-a-thons.

Boards, Friends, and Alumni Association Support

Development is a team sport. It's not just the director of development and his or her staff, but the university librarian, and often the director of communications and subject specialists, who influence donors toward making a gift to the library. For the most mature library development programs, it's also often major gifts generalists and planned gift officers, and senior university administrators, including the president or chancellor, who help influence donors to support the library. But it is also student and alumni groups, Friends of the Library, and boards that ensure the long-term health of the library through financial support and advocacy.

Twenty-nine of 51 respondents (57%) reported having a library development board. Of those, 27 (93%) said that board members were expected to support the library financially and 24 (83%) through advocacy. Twenty-two respondents (43%) said they had a library friends group, with 19 of them (86%) expected to support the library financially and 11 (50%) to support it through advocacy. Forty respondents (67%) reported that their institution had an alumni association, but only two (5%)

of those said that it supported the library financially, while 14 (35%) said their university's alumni association supported the library through advocacy. Twenty-seven (45%) reported their library has a student advisory board; although none reported that board supports the library financially, 15 (56%) indicated they support the library through advocacy. Fifteen respondents (25%) reported that a group other than those listed above exists at their institution: these include a librarian emeriti board, faculty advisory board, special collections advisory board, and alumni outreach group. Of those, five (33%) support their library both financially and through advocacy, while seven (47%) support them through advocacy only. At the 29 libraries that reported having a development board, the average size of the board is 36.53 members. The fewest number of members is 1; the largest number of members is 45. Most reported having a chair or president and members. A small handful indicated they had a vice chair and still others had chairs of subcommittees. Twenty-six (84%) responded that the processes, terms, obligations, and other conditions of their development committees are comparable to other schools and units on campus. Only five (16%) reported that they were not, and one didn't know.

Thirty-eight of 49 respondents said their development program is engaged in activities that could be characterized as "friend-raising." Thirty of those provided a long list of great ideas for engaging potential donors, including programs and events (large and small), dinners, exhibitions, special events, lectures and author readings, presentations, tours, open houses and community engagement, and holiday parties. Many of these events and programs target community patrons and local alumni. In addition, several libraries note that their development officer is a member of local organizations like Rotary Club for the purpose of friend-raising.

Donor Communications

For the purpose of this survey, donor communications include print and electronic communications used to solicit or steward potential donors. They may include library stories, statistics, and other measures used to convey library value and success. While most of the libraries are soliciting and stewarding their donors in both print and electronic format, the preferred means still appears to be print. The way in which libraries otherwise communicate with potential donors seems to vary depending on the content.

Thirty-two libraries use both print and electronic means to solicit potential donors, Fifteen use print only, and three use electronic only. In sending stewardship letters to their donors, 21 libraries use both print and electronic communication to steward their donors, 29 use print only, and none use electronic only. Libraries are much more likely to send a print version than an electronic version of their magazine, although they are more likely to send an electronic version of their newsletter than a print version. Interestingly, more libraries report sharing newsletters than magazines. Forty-five respondents (85%) said they send informal communication, like birthday cards, to donors. Twenty-five libraries use print exclusively, 17 use both print and electronic, and three use electronic exclusively.

Twenty-three libraries send out other types of donor communications. Of those, 17 use both print and electronic communication, and three use either print or electronic exclusively. These types of communications include proposals, annual reports, event invitations, brochures and pamphlets, endowment impact reports, blogs, and social media (like Facebook and Twitter posts). Among the quantitative measures of library outcomes and performance used in these communications, beyond metrics or statistics like gate counts, many libraries share fundraising totals (like number of donors, dollars raised). More importantly, some libraries are attempting to show how those dollars are impacting student success. Several are very wisely using analytics to track the effectiveness of their electronic communications with potential donors. If available, some libraries would try to show the impact of their collections on research and the impact on student success. There also seems to be an interest in measuring the impact library collections have on university departments as a way to demonstrate value.

Because it is difficult to quantify the impact unrestricted gifts have on library services and collections, and even more difficult to connect those services and collections with student success and faculty research, much communication is aimed at anecdotal evidence. Using direct quotes from those who have benefited from the library makes a more compelling argument. And, to borrow a well-worn phrase, a picture is worth a thousand words: photographs of smiling happy undergraduates studying in the library go a long way to illustrate impact. In addition to stories of student success, many libraries run stories on exhibitions, events, and other activities.

It was encouraging to see so many development officers puzzling over what types of qualitative measures of library outcomes and performance they would use if they were available. Several specifically mentioned or intimated that they were working with assessment staff to determine how they might draw more direct correlations between what they were doing (e.g., hosting events, soliciting donors) and increased funding. It is especially important to relate these outcomes to the library's expressed strategic directions.

ARL member libraries have released statements affirming their commitment to the core values they all share. In fact, ARL is collecting links to member libraries' web sites (<http://www.arl.org/focus-areas/public-access-policies/federally-funded-research/4225#.WwRcxMlDvcs>). However, only 22 of the 50 libraries (44%) responding to the question about intellectual freedom said they explicitly used, described, or discussed in their communication with stakeholders this core principle. As these core values continue to be assaulted, it would be interesting to see if more ARL member libraries began publicly affirming their commitment to these core values several years from now. Interestingly, a much higher percentage (74%) said they explicitly stated their commitment to inclusion and diversity in their communications with stakeholders.

Finally, to whom the communications officer reports could have a significant impact on communication with potential donors. Of the 51 libraries that responded to the question about where the communications professional reports, only eight (16%) said the director of communications reported to the library development office. More often communications professionals report to an AUL or deputy director or to the library director.

Capital Campaign

Fifty libraries (83%) reported that their university or parent institution was recently or currently is in a capital campaign. Forty-five were able to report the amount of their institution's goal. The average goal was \$1.998 billion, with a low of \$75 million and a high of more than \$6 billion. Twenty respondents reported their university's campaign had concluded and that they raised just over \$1.9 billion, on average. The largest amount raised was \$6.4 billion. Of those 20 institutions, all met or exceeded their goal.

Forty-three respondents reported on their library's overall stated goal during the most recent or current capital campaign. On average, the goal was \$29 million. The lowest goal was \$1 million and the highest was \$240 million. While most libraries had a goal of a little over 1% of their institution's overall goal, the \$240M goal of one library represented 10% of their university's goal. While this might appear daunting, it also reflects the priority of the library to that institution.

Because, as we will see, nearly half of the library's that participated in their university's capital campaign did not meet their goal, who establishes the library's capital goal can go a long way in determining success or failure. Of the 44 libraries that responded to this question, half said the library's goal in the last or current capital campaign was determined jointly between central development or university administration and the library. The other half were split evenly, with half being determined exclusively by the university and half set exclusively by the library.

Nine of 49 respondents (18%) said there was a specific distinction in the goals for gifts, pledge payments, and matching gifts, pledges, and gifts in kind expected to be raised during the library's capital

campaign. Forty (82%) did not have such a distinction. Only five (10%) libraries reported having a separate “cash” goal for the campaign. These ranged from \$6 to \$65 million.

Thirteen libraries that were part of their university’s capital campaign reported final campaign numbers. Only six libraries (46%) met or exceeded their campaign goal; seven libraries (54%) did not meet their campaign goals. Of the seven that failed to meet their goal, two were set by the library alone, two were set by the university alone, two were set jointly, and one did not know who set their goal. Of the six that met or exceeded their goal, three were set by the library alone and three were set jointly. This shows a much greater rate of success when the library either sets its own campaign goal or does so by coordinating with the university.

Gifts in Kind

Development officers who post questions about gifts in kind (GIK) on the LIBDEV discussion list often want to know if libraries have an established practice or policy requiring development officers to explicitly request, encourage, or require cash gift(s) for processing GIK’s. Fifty-one libraries responded to a question about this in this survey. Of those, 34 (67%) said they requested or encouraged a cash gift for processing the collection, 16 (31%) said they did not request additional cash to process the collection, and 1 (2%) said they required a cash gift to process the collection.

Forty-four libraries provided the percentage of annual giving from GIK over the last five years. The mean was 30% and the median was 25%. The minimum was 1% and the maximum was 85%.

Building Projects

If your library recently concluded or is in the planning phase of a new building or renovation, you’re not alone. More than three quarters (77%) of the 52 libraries that responded to this question either recently completed a renovation or new building, or were planning for one. Of these 40 libraries, 26 (65%) said their project was or would be part of a capital campaign. The final costs of these projects are a significant investment. Thirty-one libraries responded that the final expected cost of their new or renovated library space is, on average, \$52 million. The low was \$1 million and the high was \$200 million. Surprisingly, when asked what percentage of the total cost the library was responsible for, of the 20 libraries that replied, ten (50%) said that their library is responsible for 100% of the total cost. The average was 66.5%, with a low of 3% and a high of 100%.

Conclusion

The purpose of this survey, in part, was to provide longitudinal data to the SPEC survey on development conducted in 2006, to determine the impact on academic research library development from the 2008 recession and substantial cuts to the budgets of many public institutions. The authors also hoped to gather data on areas that are germane to nearly all academic research libraries: building projects, both new and renovations, capital campaigns, boards that support libraries financially and through advocacy, and communicating with donors.

In results similar to those found in the 2006 survey, a very high percentage of library directors are not required by their institution to spend a specific amount of time engaged in fundraising; however, the average time spent by directors on fundraising activities is approaching 40%. Today, a sizeable majority of library directors make contact calls on donors or prospects without their director of development, similar to what was revealed in the earlier survey. Interestingly, it appears the amount of money raised by library directors is less important than it was in 2006; however, in 2018 it is significantly more important for library directors to visit and qualify potential donors.

At nearly all of the responding institutions, the amount of dollars raised and the number of visits and solicitations were extremely important in evaluation the library’s chief development officer. These

metrics of evaluation have increased since the earlier survey. Subordinate library development staff are much less likely to be evaluated on amount of money raised compared to how they were evaluated 12 years ago.

While most libraries continue to be included in campus-wide mailings and phone-a-thons, most respondents reported that the library was not positioned or supported like other units, schools, or colleges at their institutions. This only appears to have gotten worse since the 2006 survey.

A surprisingly low number of responding libraries have development boards. While it's true that having a board requires work, the literature and anecdotal evidence indicates that the benefits in both advocacy and philanthropy can be significant. The vast majority of libraries that do have a board indicate that they are governed by the same terms as other boards on campus, which improves the library board's credibility. While an extremely high number of responding libraries communicate with potential donors, in both print and electronic formats, in only a very small handful of libraries does the director of communications report to the development office. Of those libraries that met or exceeded their goal in their institution's recent capital campaign, more than half have the development office overseeing the work of communications.

A very high percentage of responding libraries claimed to either be engaged in or to have recently completed a capital campaign or a building project (new or renovated). The cost of building projects was significant, with the average being more than \$52 million; half of those responding claimed their library was responsible for securing 100% of the funds. While those libraries that were engaged in or recently completed a capital campaign had ambitious goals, a high percentage of those that had completed their campaign did not meet or exceed their goal. In addition, responding libraries said that, on average, 30% of the money they report as raising comes from Gifts in Kind.

Generally, the authors found that development is a significant and growing activity among responding institutions. The staffing to support fund-raising has generally grown since the 2006 survey, albeit at a reasonable pace, development officers are more often recruited from other fund-raising experiences, rather than among the MLS-holding librarians, which was a bit more common in 2006, and responding libraries are engaged in a variety of development activities ranging from attracting potential donors through library tours, exhibitions, and events, to working with senior university administrators to close principal gifts. The representative documents also offer evidence of robust programs, positions to support them, and materials to communicate them among responding institutions.

Survey Questions and Responses

The SPEC Survey on Library Development was designed by **Brian W. Keith**, Associate Dean for Administrative Services and Faculty Affairs, at the George A. Smathers Libraries, University of Florida; **Joseph A. Salem, Jr.**, Associate Dean for Learning, Undergraduate Services and Commonwealth Campus Libraries, at Pennsylvania State University; and **Kurt Cumiskey**, Associate Director of Development, at Duke University Libraries. These results are based on responses from 60 of the 125 ARL member libraries (48%) by the deadline of March 29, 2018. The survey's introductory text and questions are reproduced below, followed by the response data and selected comments from the respondents.

Senior library administrators continue to assess their organization's commitment to and capacity for development, and the efficacy of their efforts. The role of library fundraising and the related need for libraries to foster stakeholder and advocacy relationships has changed and expanded over time, and has become even more critical; fiscally, strategically, and organizationally. Additionally, the role of metrics and performance indicators in communicating library value and performance to stakeholders, which will be touched on in this survey, is a particularly timely topic as it is part of the national dialogue among library leaders.

Industry wide assessments of practices and policies, resources and measures for library development are limited. The most recent SPEC survey on library development topic was published in 2006 (SPEC Kit 297: Library Development). That study was completed prior to the Great Recession, which lasted from 2007 to 2009, and was the longest recession since World War II. During that period, the demand for enrollment in higher education increased, while budget situations of public colleges and universities eroded dramatically with a decline in state support. Both public and private institutions were impacted by the drop in endowment values and reduced donor support. Following the recession, fundraising continued to be a challenge, but as the recovery persisted outcomes improved. Given the importance of library development and the continuing change in higher education and research libraries, this topic needs to be revisited.

The purpose of this study is to better understand the supporting structures and resources (personnel, financial, and material) and the activities and expectations associated with library development (fundraising and friendraising) efforts. This survey retains some elements of the 2006 study for longitudinal comparison of the pre-recession environment and the current, post-recession environment, and includes new elements to more broadly depict the current role of library development, including friendraising (efforts intended to generate committed and supportive relationships with outside parties and entities), communication to stakeholders of library value added, and stories and/or descriptive measures provided in these communication efforts. The survey also examines the role of advisory boards

in the fundraising process. Since many academic libraries are either currently or soon will be engaged in a capital campaign or the renovation of an old or construction of a new library, the survey also examines the complexities of these common endeavors.

BACKGROUND

1. Please indicate which of the following components are a part of your library's development program. Check all that apply. N=59

Fundraising professional(s) assigned to raise money for the library	55	93%
Direct mail on behalf of the library's fundraising priorities	53	90%
Printed giving materials	51	86%
A history of private support in excess of \$500,000 per year	42	71%
Phone-a-thon on behalf of the library's fundraising priorities	37	63%
A library development board	34	58%
A friends of the library organization	30	51%
Other component	23	39%

Please briefly describe the other component. N=23

1-on-1 solicitations, communications department, electronic materials

1:1 communication/relationship building, events, visits/meals

All of the fundraising activity for the Libraries is coordinated by the university's central development office. This includes fundraising professionals who raise money for the Libraries, in addition to other campus priorities. It also includes creation and distribution of printed giving materials, selection, and management of our library development board, and collection and management of the gifts and pledges for the Libraries.

Also integrated with university museum's development. Central university-wide annual giving, gift planning.

An active stewardship program that is a partnership between the library and the university's office of advancement, which is ultimately responsible for all university fundraising.

Annual fundraising event and smaller themed cultivation events

Assist with fundraising for other groups that fall under the library's umbrella, such as our Geo-Spatial Centroid and our Information Science & Technology Center (ISTeC).

Bi-annual newsletter, thank-you week by students, retiree engagement events, annual giving program events

Considered a "friends of the library" is our Libraries Alumni Outreach Group (LAOG), which is comprised of a group of interested and committed alumni who share a passion for the Libraries and the furthering of our mission. The group meets annually to strategize and advise on issues including: honing our social media presence, networking with alumni, crafting appropriate messaging to potential donors, and identifying and cultivating pipeline prospects. Other fundraising initiatives are: crowd funding, online wish, and university match.

Email solicitations, stewardship letters, collections calendar, annual report

Events around fundraising and stewardship

Events planning and support

Friends group was dissolved in 2017 so I didn't check box. There are four years out of 14 (I'm able to collect data going back to FY ending 6/30/04). I didn't check the \$500k box because we don't consistently raise that much.

Gifts and estate planning (legacy giving)

National Council, which is part development, part advocacy, and part advice.

Online/web-based giving platform both specific to the Libraries web pages and the university's web presence.

Our fundraising professional is a University Foundation development professional assigned part-time to the Libraries.

Our library does not have a Libraries development officer or a Libraries development office. All donations to the Libraries are processed through the University Foundation.

Stewardship and cultivation events

The library's development officer retired two years ago, and the office of advancement hasn't replaced her yet. There are plans to once the next campaign begins. And in the meantime, someone from OA works with the library on fundraising efforts.

We are sometimes included in the phone-a-thon but it is not every year and the level of inclusion we get varies greatly, usually to the side of not being included.

We closed the Friends of the Library program a few years ago. The library development board is also on hold. Our campus is participating in its second digital fundraising effort set for April 12, 2018. A development council was created in 2014 by the library development director with key curators and librarians to create protocols and better coordinate development opportunities.

We have a 36-member library advisory council that I manage. I consider this to be different from a Friends of the Library and a library development board.

- 2. Please indicate the year the first chief library development officer (LDO) was hired (including one who worked less than full-time), the year your library founded a friends of the libraries group, founded a library development board, and/or first raised more than \$500,000 in a year. N=51

Year first LDO was hired N=42

Year	N
1980–1984	3
1985–1989	5
1990–1994	7
1995–1999	8
2000–2004	8
2005–2009	5
2010–2014	4
2017	2

Year Friends group was founded N=29

Decade	N
1920	1
1930	2
1940	2
1950	2
1960	2
1970	3
1980	4
1990	6
2000	5
2010	2

Year library development board was founded N=35

Year	N
<1990	5
1990–1994	4
1995–1999	0
2000–2004	5
2005–2009	7
2010–2014	5
2015–2018	7

Year library first raised >\$500,000 N=35

Year	N
<1980	4
1980–1984	4
1985–1989	6
1990–1994	2
1995–1999	4
2000–2004	1
2005–2009	8
2010–2014	3
2015–2018	3

LIBRARY DONOR GROUPS

3. Please indicate what level of access the library has to the following donor groups/populations for solicitation purposes. Check all that apply. N=54

Donor Group/Population	Unrestricted	Limited/Special Projects	N
Current fiscal year donors to library	45	11	54
Lapsed fiscal year donors to library	45	11	53

Donor Group/Population	Unrestricted	Limited/Special Projects	N
Library employees	39	15	52
Non-donors (never givers) to the library	12	41	52
Retired library employees	40	15	52
Current fiscal year donors to other areas of the institution	5	46	50
Non-donors (never givers) to other areas of the institution	20	31	50
Lapsed fiscal year donors to other areas of the institution	9	41	49
Parents/grandparents of current students	8	42	49
Alumni	11	39	49
Retired employees of the institution (outside of the library)	10	39	48
Board of Trustees	6	43	48
Institutional employees outside of the library	9	39	47
Current students	9	38	46
University trustees	4	43	46
Parents/grandparents of alumni	9	35	44
Other potential donor group	20	15	30
Total number of respondents	52	52	54

If you selected other potential donor group/unrestricted above, please briefly describe the group.
N=18

Board of overseers

Community borrowers

Community members, corporations and foundations. Just a note, the limits are always if the prospect is currently managed by another unit.

Event attendees, In-kind donors

Federation of Aggie Mother's Clubs and A&M Clubs

Foundations, corporations

Friends of the Library

Friends of the Library, people who give the library gifts-in-kind, but are not associated with the university.

Friends, collectors

Local community members, other librarians in the state

Non-alumni, non-donor family members of donated/curated collections. Also, special interest groups (non-alumni, non-donor) who have connections to a curated collection field of interest.

Private foundations, public funders

The Libraries has access to our central prospect/research/analytics team. If we find a prospect that may not be an alum or be in our database, they can help us with research, wealth status, contact info, and philanthropic info. I can approach anyone, anywhere as long as they are not already involved in a major

gift discussion with another unit on campus. Even then, I can ask to work with that unit to include the library in the ask if it makes sense.

The university has an open cultivation policy where the library works collaboratively with other fundraisers. Special permission is needed for principal gift donors (20 prospects).

There are many friends to the university particularly in Libraries with non-alumni donors supporting collections of interest.

Those people or groups associated with the Libraries by a specific personal interest or engagement in a unique or special collecting area or interest such as Pan Am 103 who either self identify or respond to inquires to communications from these areas.

We are starting to track students who worked in the library during their undergraduate years and are now alumni, starting five years ago.

We do periodic acquisition mailings using shared or purchased lists (memberships, subscribers, etc.)

Additional comments N=3

Library personnel do not have access to any of the listed group for solicitation of gifts. Those solicitations come from the central development office.

Only the OA officer is supposed to contact our donors directly.

The library only works through the university's foundation and does not work independently to raise funds, unless a donor approaches the library directly, in which case they would be connected to the foundation for finalizing and establishing the donation.

If you selected other potential donor group/limited/special projects above, please briefly describe the group. N=10

Community leaders & principal gift prospects—all depends on whether these individuals are already assigned to gift officers. Corporations and foundations—need to work within confines of greater University Advancement structure.

Community organizations in the Greater Philadelphia Area, including peer library and cultural institutions

Corporations, foundations

Event attendees: Individuals who RSVP to library engagement events on or off campus. In-kind donors: list of people who donate in-kind books to the Libraries book sales.

Foundations, corporations

Friends of the Library, people who give the library gifts-in-kind, but are not associated with the university.

Friends of the Library; prospects discovered by interests for certain projects

It's somewhat difficult to answer these questions. I generally have to go through research to get names and it's possible anyone (non-donors, non-donors to library, current donors, current donors to library, alumni, etc.) could be assigned to another development officer, in which case I have to contact the other DO in advance.

Local community members, other librarians in the state

University foundation prospect management system helps drive solicitation access.

Additional comment N=1

Library personnel do not have access to any of the listed group for solicitation of gifts. Those solicitations come from the central development office.

LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM STAFFING

4. Please indicate the number and FTE of fundraising professionals (all forms of development activities, major gifts, foundations solicitations, etc.) who raise funds for your library. Include the LDO, vacant positions currently under recruitment, and those you expect to fill in the next 12 months. Do not include library director, non-development office AUL's, librarians, etc., or non-professional level fundraising support staff. N=52

Number of fundraising professionals N=52

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
1	10	2.21	2.00	1.67

Number	N
1	22
2	15
3	7
4	5
>4	3

Number who work 100% on library development N=52

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0	4	1.48	1.00	1.15

Number	N
0	8
1	26
2	7
3	7
4	4

Number who work less than 100% on library development N=52

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0	7	0.73	0	1.33

Number	N
0	30
1	16
2	3
3	0
4	1
5	1
7	1

Total FTE of fundraising professionals N=52

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
0.2	4.2	1.70	1.20	1.11

Number	N
<0.5	4
0.5	3
0.75	1
1	15
1.2	3
1.5	4
1.75	1
2	8
2.75	1
3	6
4	4
4.2	1

5. **Beginning with the position that is considered the chief or most senior LDO, please list the job titles for up to five professional-level library fundraising employees whose *primary* responsibilities include development activities (such as major gifts, foundations solicitations, etc.) specifically for your library. Indicate the percentage of their time spent on library fundraising (for example: Annual Giving Director, 100%; Director of Development, 100%; Direct Mail Coordinator, 75%, etc.), the title of the person(s) to whom each position reports, and their salary's funding source (e.g., line item salary, soft funding—raised through private support, joint salary between university development and library, endowed funds, etc.) For percentage of time enter a whole number without a % sign. Include vacant positions currently under recruitment and those you expect to fill in the next 12 months. N=50**

Chief/most senior LDO N=50

Job Title	% of time	Reports to	Source of Salary Funding
Assistant Dean for Advancement	100	Dean of Libraries & VP of Development (Major Gifts)	50/50 Libraries/Central Advancement
Associate Dean for External Affairs	50	Dean of Libraries/Museums, and VP of Development	35% Library, 65% Central
Associate University Librarian for Development	100	University Librarian & Vice Provost for Library Affairs	Operating budget
Chief Development Officer	100	Dean of Libraries	University Research Foundation
Coordinator for Stewardship and External Relations	100	Dean of Libraries	Library funds
Development Director	100	Library dean and University Foundation AVP	1/2 Library, 1/2 Foundation
Development Director	100	Dean of Libraries and Vice Chancellor for Development	Libraries 50%, Foundation 50%
Development Manager	100	Libraries Dean	University

Job Title	% of time	Reports to	Source of Salary Funding
Development Officer	33	Three deans, including the University Librarian	University Foundation
Development Officer II	100	Director of Libraries/Central Development	Libraries and Central Development
Director Library Alumni Affairs and Development	85	Associate ViP of Colleges and Units	Library/Alumni Affairs and Development
Director of Advancement	100	Vice Provost and Director of Libraries	University
Director of Development	100	Deputy Vice President / University Development & Alumni Relations	University Development & Alumni Relations
Director of Development	100	Vice Provost of Libraries	Gift funds
Director of Development	100	Dean of library	General budget
Director of Development	100	Executive Director, DAE	Half Library, half Development and Alumni Engagement (university)
Director of Development	100	Dean of Libraries and Executive Director or University Relations	University Relations (Central Development Office)
Director of Development	100	Dean of Libraries and Assistant VP Advancement	50% library, 50% advancement
Director of Development	100	University Librarian	Libraries
Director of Development	100	Dean of the Library	Library
Director of Development	100	Associate Vice President for Constituent Fundraisers	University Foundation
Director of Development	100	University Foundation President and Dean of University Libraries	Shared cost between University Foundation and Libraries
Director of Development	100	Dean of Libraries	Library
Director of Development	100	Chief Librarian	Library operations
Director of Development	100	Dean of Library and AVP of University Development	Library/University Advancement
Director of Development & Alumni Relations	100	Executive Director, Dean of University Libraries	University Development
Director of Development & External Relations	100	Dean of University Libraries & Senior Director of Development & Alumni Affairs	Library/state appropriated funds
Director of Development and Communication	50	Dean of Libraries	Joint between library and university development
Director of Development and Major Gifts	100	University Librarian and Associate VP in Central Development and Alumni Relations	Libraries
Director of Development, College of Arts and Science and Libraries	20	Associate Dean, College of Arts and Science	University

Job Title	% of time	Reports to	Source of Salary Funding
Director of Development, Libraries, Press and University Archives	100	Executive Director, Schools and Programs (and programmatically to Dean of Libraries)	Alumni relations and development unit of university
Director of Development, Major Gifts	100	Dean of Libraries	University/state funds
Director of Library Advancement	100	Executive Director, University Advancement	50% Library, 50% University Advancement
Director of Library Development	100	Associate Provost & University Librarian	Library operating budget
Director of Library External Affairs & Advancement	100	Library Dean and Associate V.P. of Institutional Advancement	Libraries and Institutional Advancement
Director of Philanthropy	100	Dean	Libraries (100%)
Director, Communications & Advancement	50	Dean of Libraries	Libraries
Director, Libraries Advancement	100	Vice Provost and Dean of University Libraries	24% Libraries, 76% University Advancement (central)
Director, Library Development	100	Dean of Libraries	1/2 from Libraries, 1/2 from campus Office of Advancement
Executive Director for Advancement	100	Dean of the Library	Library
Executive Director of Development	100	Dean	Line item salary
Executive Director of Development	100	Vice Provost and Director of Libraries	
Foundation Director of Development	50	Foundation Assistant Vice-President	Foundation employee
Gift Officer for University Libraries	100	Senior Vice President for Fundraising and Vice Provost for Libraries	University Foundation
Library Development Director	100	University Librarian and Central Development	Half library and half Central Development
Senior Development Officer, Major Gifts	30	University Office of Advancement	Office of Advancement
Senior Director of Advancement	50	Office of Development leadership	University Advancement
Senior Director of Development	50	VP for development	Development
Senior Executive Director of Development	30	Vice President for Development	University Foundation
Senior Director of Development	50	Associate Vice Chancellor	Institutional Advancement and Library

Position 2 N=26

Job Title	% of time	Reports to	Source of Salary Funding
Assistant Director of Donor Relations	100	Director of Development and Communication	Library
Assistant Director, Advancement	100	Director, Communications & Advancement	Libraries
Assistant Director, External Relations	100	Director of Development	University Relations (Central Development Office)
Associate Director, Libraries Advancement	100	Director, Libraries Advancement	45% Libraries, 55% University Advancement (central)
Associate Director for Development	100	Associate University Librarian for Development	Operating budget
Associate Director of Development	100	Executive Director	Soft funding
Associate Director of Development & Alumni Relations	100	Director of Development & Alumni Relations	50% University Development, 50% Libraries
Associate Director of Development, Major Gifts	100	Associate Dean	50% Libraries, 50% Central
Corporate and Foundation Relations Officer	20	Assistant VP, Corporate and Foundation Relations	University Foundation
Development Assistant	75	Library Development Director	Library: focus is gift processing, development events
Development Associate	100	Director of Advancement	University
Development Officer	100	Director of Development	Half Library, half Development and Alumni Engagement (university)
Development Officer I	100	Development Officer II	Libraries
Director of Annual Giving and Donor Relations	50	Director of Development and Major Gifts	Libraries
Director of Development	100	Assistant Dean for Advancement	Libraries, 100%
Director of Development	100	Senior Executive Director of Development	University Foundation
Director of Development, Major Gifts	100	Executive Director of Development	
Director of Library External Relations	100	Vice Provost for Libraries and Museums	Libraries
Donor Relations and Stewardship Coordinator	100	Director of Development	Library
Grants and Contracts Specialist	100	Dean of Libraries	Library funds
Major Gifts Officer	100	Executive Director	Library
Manager of Development Operations and Donor Stewardship	100	Chief Development Officer	University Research Foundation

Job Title	% of time	Reports to	Source of Salary Funding
Program Associate	20	Director of Development	University Foundation
Program Coordinator	100	Development Director	Library (PBL, I think, but do not know for sure)
Senior Associate Director	100	Director of Development	General budget
Senior Development Associate	100	Director of Development	Libraries

Position 3 N=14

Job Title	% of time	Reports to	Source of Salary Funding
Administrative Assistant	5	Associate Director for Business Administration	Gift funds
Advancement and Communications Associate	50	Assistant Dean for Advancement/Director of Communication, Library	Libraries, 100%
Advancement Associate	100	Executive Director	Line item salary
Annual Giving Coordinator	100	Associate University Librarian for Development	Operating budget
Assistant Director, Libraries Advancement	100	Director, Libraries Advancement	40% Libraries, 60% University Advancement (central)
Assistant Director of Development & Alumni Relations	100	Director of Development & Alumni Relations	University Development
Associate Director	100	Director of Development	General budget
Associate Director of Development, Annual Giving	100	Associate Dean	100% Central
Development Assistant	100	Director of Advancement	University
Development Communications Manager	100	Director of Development	Libraries
Development Coordinator	100	Director of Development	Half Library, half Development and Alumni Engagement (university)
Development Officer	50	University Endowment Association	Endowment
Development Officer, Friends of the Library	100	Executive Director of Development	
Major Gifts Officer	100	Executive Director	Library

Position 4 N=9

Job Title	% of time	Reports to	Source of Salary Funding
Administrative Aide	100	Director of Development	50% Libraries, 50% University Development & Alumni Relations
Administrative Assistant	75	Director of Administrative Services	Line item salary
Advancement Coordinator	100	Executive Director	Library

Job Title	% of time	Reports to	Source of Salary Funding
Advancement Services Officer	100	Director, Libraries Advancement	55% Libraries, 45% University Advancement (central)
Alumni Relations and Stewardship Officer 1	100	Director of Development & Alumni Relations	University Development
Dean of Libraries, University Librarian	25	University Provost	University Libraries, 100%
Development and Events Manager	100	Associate Dean	100% Central
Director of Communications	5	Associate Director for Business Administration	University funds
Program Associate, Friends of the Library	100	Development Officer, Friends of the Library	

Position 5 N=3

Job Title	% of time	Reports to	Source of Salary Funding
Administrative Support Coordinator	100	Director of Development & Alumni Relations	Libraries
Advancement Program Coordinator	100	Director, Libraries Advancement	100% Libraries
Development Coordinator	70	Associate Dean	85% Libraries, 15% Central

CHIEF LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT OFFICER

6. Please indicate how long the current chief/most senior LDO has held this position at your library and how long in total this individual has held a chief/most senior LDO position at any other library. N=48

Years as Chief LDO at our library N=48

Range: 2 weeks to 21 years

Years as Chief LDO at previous libraries N=39

Range: 0 to 13 years

Position	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	N
Chief LDO at our library	0.04	21	4.16	3.00	4.22	48
Chief LDO at previous libraries	0	13	1.21	0	3.03	39

7. What position did the current chief/most senior LDO hold before taking this position? Check all that apply. N=49

Another fundraising position in higher education, but not within a library	27	55%
Another fundraising position not in higher education or libraries	15	31%
A fundraising professional position in a library development program	6	12%
A non-fundraising, but professional level position within a library	1	2%

A different fundraising position within this library	1	2%
Other position	5	10%

Please briefly describe the other position. N=5

- Director of advancement communication for university (alumni magazine)
- Director of marketing & event management at another higher education institution
- Foundation employee, not familiar with her prior experience.
- Not known
- Senior program officer, Philadelphia Foundation

Additional comments N=4

Answered Another fundraising position in higher education N=3

- A professional position in current university's development program
- Associate dean for external affairs - school of public health and school of arts and sciences
- Director of annual giving for school of nursing

Answered Another fundraising position not in higher education N=1

Served as executive director of not-for-profit performing arts center, executive director of not-for-profit ballet company, and co-artistic director of not-for-profit ballet company.

8. Is the chief/most senior LDO at the same organizational level within the library as an associate university librarian/associate director, or as department chairs and other unit heads, or at another level? N=50

Same level as department heads	23	46%
Same level as AUL	15	30%
Other level	12	24%

Please briefly explain the other level. N=12

- Different reporting units
- Direct report to the dean, but is not part of the routine library operations or has any direct reports.
- Director of development level at university foundation
- I have no reporting lines to the librarian, therefore I carry a development title only and would fall just below an associate dean or executive director of another area of campus.
- Non-library employee
- Same level as frontline fundraisers in academic faculties at the university.
- The director of development for the libraries position, which is administratively part of central development operation, is not directly comparable to either library department heads or AULs within the libraries organization.
- The position does not reside with the library, but separately within the university's office of advancement.

This person is not within the university system, but part of the foundation, which is a non-profit that is associated with the university but a discrete organization.

This position is not seen as a library position. I do participate in associate level activities.

Totally different HR system, not able to determine.

Unit head, not comparable to other unit heads/chairs

Additional comments N=3

I serve on the dean's cabinet with other associate and assistant deans.

The chief LDO is a direct report to the dean, similar to associate deans.

The LDO reports to development with dotted line to me. In that sense he would be equivalent to an AUL.

9. Please indicate the degrees completed by the chief/most senior LDO. Check all that apply. N=50

BA/BS	40	80%
MLIS (or equivalent)	5	10%
JD	1	2%
EdD	0	—
PhD	0	—
Other degree	21	44%

Please specify the other degree. N=21

BBA, MBA

M Ed

MA, currently pursuing PhD

MA in anthropology, academic field

Master degree in a liberal arts discipline

Master of Arts (2 responses)

Master of Science, arts administration

Master's degree required, though field of study is not predetermined. I have an MA in Art History.

Masters degree in higher education administration

MBA (4 responses)

MBA, MA journalism

MFA

MHP, Master of health professions (dual concentrations—health policy and health management)

MPA

MS, journalism/marketing communications

N/A-vacant

Non-library employee

10. For the chief/most senior LDO, please estimate the percentage of time spent on the following activities. N=50

Annual Giving – direct mail, phone-a-thons, web giving; typically less than \$10,000

Donor Relations – stewardship reports, endowment reports, etc.

Major Gifts – individual meetings and proposals; typically more than \$10,000

Special Events – donor events, galas, book signings, etc.

Corporation and Foundation Relations— includes grant writing

Friends/Board Management – oversight of volunteer structure

Staff and Office Management – policies, procedures and human resources

Other activity – any responsibility not listed above

Activity	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	N
Annual Giving	0	30	9.15	7.50	7.24	48
Donor Relations	0	50	13.81	10.00	10.65	48
Major Gifts	0	90	42.60	50.00	22.79	48
Special Events	0	40	10.06	7.50	8.66	48
Corporation and Foundation Relations	0	20	4.38	5.00	4.94	48
Friends/Board Management	0	30	7.94	5.00	7.81	48
Staff and Office Management	0	30	8.98	8.00	7.28	48
Other activity	3	50	13.67	10.00	15.12	9

If you indicated other activity above, please briefly describe it. N=8

10%: Clerical: entering contact reports, running reports, and mailing letters

5%: Committees for the Foundation, job panels

25%: I am the director of communications. Also, I spend a lot of time attending central development meetings and library senior management meetings—probably 5–10% of my time.

10%: Internal meetings and events

5%: Participation in ALDIN, ALA attendance, some library committees

3%: staffing the dean

50%: The LDO works with another academic unit in addition to the Libraries.

5%: We manage the stewardship of all library donors so some of my time is spent gathering the necessary information for them.

Additional comments N=3

I work about 60 hours a week so prorate the percentages. There’s also strategic and other Libraries and advancement planning duties.

Since this person is responsible for three large colleges/divisions, I am not able to answer this set of questions.

We don’t know the breakdown of her time.

11. By whom are the annual goals for library fundraising determined? N=50

Advancement

Annual giving department in conjunction with the DO

Associate dean, dean of the libraries, central development, staff

Associate provost and university librarian

Associate university librarian for development

Associate vice president in the Purdue research foundation

By the LDO in consultation with the dean and the VP of university advancement

Central development

Central development office

Central development with some library input

Central foundation

Central university and library director of development; in consultation with dean of library and associate dean of library

Chief fundraising officer in partnership with associate vice president for college and units and the university librarian

Chief LDO in concert with dean of libraries

Collective between dean, assistant provost, and university foundation

Dean of libraries

Dean of university libraries & senior director of development & alumni affairs

Dean, senior VP for advancement, director-library advancement

Dean's cabinet

Determined by university librarian in consultation with director of development.

Development director with final approval of university foundation

Director of advancement and director of libraries

Director of development, with input from dean of libraries and senior staff at central development operation

Director of library development and executive director, DAE

Executive director

Executive director and director of development & alumni relations

Executive director, university advancement

Foundation staff

Institutional advancement and library dean

Jointly between the foundation and dean

Jointly by Libraries and foundation office

Jointly with central development

LDO

LDO, dean of libraries, academic affairs
 LDO, chief librarian, and university advancement
 LDO, dean of libraries, VP of development, director of library development
 Library development director, university librarian, and central development
 Library director and development
 Library director of development and university librarian signs off.
 Supervisor in institutional advancement
 SVP development, DOD, dean of libraries
 The library and office of advancement
 There are no established goals since I have been in the position. It is assumed that the university librarian will seek out and pursue fundraising but there is no goal or cap put on it. There are a lot of restrictions on fundraising at our institution.
 University advancement in collaboration with the dean of libraries
 University central development
 University foundation
 University librarian + management team + provost
 University relations (central development)
 Vice provost
 VP for advancement

12. Please enter the minimum amount for a major gift. Enter a whole number without a currency symbol. N=48

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
10,000	250,000	51,723	25,000	45,762

Amount	N
10,000	7
11,000	1
25,000	18
50,000	7
100,000	13
250,000	1

Comments N=3

Currently \$25,000, soon to be \$100,000.

For the university: \$25,000; for Libraries more like \$5K or \$10K.

This varies depending on what is associated with the major gift, such as naming opportunities, etc.

LIBRARY DIRECTOR'S ROLE IN DEVELOPMENT

13. Does the institution require the library director to spend a specific amount of time on fundraising activities in the course of a typical year? N=53

Yes 13 25%
No 40 75%

If yes, please indicate the percentage of time required. N=10

Percentage	N
20	1
25	1
35	2
40	3
75	1
90	1
100	1

Comments N=3

It is not clearly defined.

Need to reach goal by a combination of major gifts, annual donations, and planned gifts.

Nothing official, but generally 40% of their time

14. Please indicate the approximate percentage of time the library director actually spends on fundraising activities in the course of a year. N=50

Percentage of time

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev
2	100	35.82	25.00	28.90

Percentage	N
2	1
5	2
10	5
15	5
18	1
20	7
23	1
25	6
30	6
33	1
40	2
50	3

Percentage	N
65	1
75	2
90	3
95	1
100	3

15. Please indicate whether there is a financial threshold that gifts must meet before the library director participates in any of the following activities. Check all that apply. N=40

Sign letters of correspondence (including electronic communications)	27	68%
Presenting proposal	26	65%
Closing a gift	25	63%
Prospect meetings	24	60%
Prospect strategy sessions	23	58%
Initiate phone calls to donor prospects	14	35%
Other activity	6	15%

Please briefly describe the other activity. N=6

Cultivation events, special events

Deeds of gift

Partnering with curators and librarians about presenting donors with information about securing appraisals for collections we want to receive over \$5,000 and protocols around securing the appraisal and tax form signatures from CFO.

Stewardship/donor relations activities

University foundation events, university foundation board meetings

Working with our board of advocates and attending alumni events.

Additional comments N=4

Case-by-case

Difficult to answer. It's all generally on a case-by-case basis and sometimes has nothing to do with amount. Some donors (former friends group members) want to hear from the dean, others would rather hear from directors of specific programs.

There is no financial threshold that gifts must meet before the library director participates. I engage at every level with gifts from signing letters to meeting with prospective donors, etc.

These are evaluated on an individual basis.

If there is a minimum amount, please enter the amount. N=34

Activity	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Std Dev	N
Sign letters of correspondence	100	5,000	880.95	500	1,087.37	21
Presenting proposal	1,000	100,000	58,111.11	50,000	41,118.04	19
Closing a gift	5,000	250,000	78,823.53	50,000	74,004.42	17
Prospect strategy sessions	25,000	500,000	104,166.67	37,500	140,951.85	18
Initiate phone calls to donor prospects	500	250,000	76,500.00	50,000	86,370.81	7
Prospect meetings	10,000	250,000	60,909.09	25,000	70,278.67	11

Comments N=4

Sign letters of correspondence N=2

All donations need a signed gift agreement that I sign for the library.
Varies by project at the request of or working with the foundation.

Presenting proposal N=4

Development reviews all library proposals, private or grants.
No minimum, but usually 50,000+.

Varies

Varies by project at the request of or working with the foundation.

Closing a gift N=3

No limit—small amounts are deposited into a fund with the foundation that covers a wide range of expenses for the library.

Varies

Varies by project at the request of or working with the foundation.

Prospect strategy sessions N=3

Depends on donor and proposal from 50,000 and up.

Varies

Varies by project at the request of or working with the foundation.

Initiate phone calls to donor prospects N=3

Depends on donor.

Varies

Varies by project at the request of or working with the foundation.

Prospect meetings N=3

Depends on donor.

Generally doesn't occur.

Varies by project at the request of or working with the foundation.

Other activity N=1

Deed of gift

16. Does the library director participate in fundraising calls without the presence of the chief/most senior LDO or other fundraising staff members? N=54

Yes	39	72%
No	15	28%

Comments N=12

Answered Yes N=8

Above figures are approximations, not rules. It is hard to separate formal fundraising from "earlier" steps of outreach.

During acknowledgment of gift calls, calls with development board members, assigned donor prospects for whom we have developed strategies, as part of major donor stewardship and cultivation per developed strategies.

Not often, but sometimes donors want to meet with the UL only and I will meet with donors independent of the foundation development officer, but inform the donor that eventually the foundation has to become involved as they managed those monies.

On occasion

Sometimes. If the donor has a relationship with the dean he/she will contact the dean and then the donor/prospective donor is referred to DOD.

These calls are for cultivation purposes rather than direct asks.

This is rare, but only when the dean has the best relationship with donor/prospect and they have shown a preference.

We have a donor who is a celebrity and has the relationship with the dean. There are other rare instances like this, but for the most part the LDO makes the call.

Answered No N=4

He may meet to build the relationship but does not make an ask with the fundraiser present to work out the details.

I am a one-man operation, so I do it all.

Sometimes these are made via phone but the preference is to meet with the donors face-to-face and ask for major gifts together—UL and library LDO.

Stewardship meetings yes, but not fundraising calls.

UNIVERSITY'S ROLE IN LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT

If your library is not part of an academic institution, please continue to the next screen.

17. Does the provost or chief academic officer actively engage in fundraising for the library (e.g., soliciting gifts)? N=53

Yes	20	38%
No	33	62%

If yes, please describe their role and the results. N=17

Aids in securing major gifts of over \$100,000 and attends visits/stewardship events with high-capacity donors.

As needed, depending upon gift nature and provost's connection to donor.

As requested by the dean of libraries.

Conducts visits, assists in proposal delivery for high-level alumni/donors. Donors and alumni appreciate the high-level engagement.

If strategy indicates that the dean of library is the best person to conduct the solicitation, a strategy is determined and a gift ask scheduled.

In her role as provost, she supports the fundraising goals and priorities of all schools, colleges, and units, including the Libraries.

It depends on the relationship with the university.

Limited to attending donor/special events.

Meeting with potential donor.

Occasionally meets with major gift prospects for the libraries; attends donor stewardship events; recommends strategies for certain targets.

On a selected basis and with coordination from central development and the library UL and library LDO.

Provost is available for cultivation and stewardship.

So far very rare. Two examples: staff campaign that featured the libraries, and currently in discussion for potential corporate gift that would cover multiple colleges/units, including libraries.

The dean of the library and I call donors regularly to thank them for their recent gifts, and he occasionally accompanies me on visits with donors.

The provost engages in fundraising on behalf of the library's current building project, however the extent of this effort is not known.

The provost has been on donor visits with and without the library director. Results have been positive.

The provost meets with selected donors at special events and fundraising weekends. At this time, he talks with them about funding priorities throughout his area, including the libraries.

Additional comments N=3

Director supports the dean's outreach (e.g., letters, meetings, etc.)

Not actively

This provost has been in office for two years; no fundraising on behalf of library to date.

18. Does the university president actively engage in fundraising for the library (e.g., soliciting gifts)?

N=53

Yes	25	47%
No	28	53%

If yes, please describe their role and the results. N=21

Again rare. President has visited high-level donor as a stewardship visit and would meet with prospects at the half million level.

Ambassador, cultivation, prospect identification, and stewardship

As needed, depending upon gift nature and president's connection to donor.

Attending donor/special events and contributed cost share funding for major NEH grant.

Chancellor is active in all principal gift conversations and lends his involvement to asks at the major gift level as well. This includes gifts for the Libraries at the principal and major gift levels. The chancellor includes the Libraries in his consideration for gifts to the institution.

Conducts visits, special events, stewardship, correspondence, telephone calls. Donors and alumni appreciate the high-level engagement.

Depending on other priorities, the president may engage in fundraising as requested by the dean of libraries.

For large gifts the president will occasionally assist in cultivation and recognition—rare, but important and helpful.

Has identified potential library donors for which the library would follow up.

In his role as president, he supports the fundraising goals and priorities of all schools, colleges, and units, including the Libraries.

Large donors (1M+) and acknowledgment letters for gifts over \$100,000 or trustee gifts

Meets with highly rated prospects/donors only.

Occasionally routes an undesignated gift to the libraries; occasionally meets with major gift prospects for the libraries, IF it is high profile target (e.g., building project) and a very high-capacity donor.

On a limited basis and coordinated via central development and the UL.

Once, and in a cultivation capacity rather than solicitation.

Only at the highest levels. Has addressed our advisory board.

Rarely. Recently worked with the president on gift-in-kind collection.

The president has met with donors at the request of the chief LDO in concert with the dean of libraries and the office of philanthropy. This is a rarity, but it does happen with gifts of substantial size.

The president often calls on and meets with our major donors.

The president works with the institute's development team to solicit gifts for the library's current construction project.

The provost meets with selected donors at special events and fundraising weekends. At this time, he talks with them about funding priorities throughout the university, including the libraries.

Additional comments N=3

Not specifically

Very limited

Willing, but has not actually done so to date.

19. Are college deans or other college administrators actively supportive of fundraising for the library? N=53

Yes 24 45%

No 29 55%

If yes, please describe their role and the results. N=19

As needed, depending upon nature of gift to campus unit that they oversee.

Certain deans have, in the past, been supportive of specific gifts being discussed for the libraries.

Cultivation and stewardship

If the gift also benefits their units.

Limited to attending donor/special events.

Many support the libraries themselves.

Not all, but arts & sciences dean has been supportive of collaborative gifts.

Primarily in a peripheral way

Schools/colleges/units are partners in gifts involving the Libraries where there is an active partnership between the Libraries and the school/college/unit. Dean of libraries actively seeks partnerships that benefit both college or school and Libraries.

Several deans visit, take tours, and/or make gifts to the Libraries.

Some deans will refer donors to the library, or collaborate with library director.

Sometimes for joint initiatives related to endowed faculty chairs or specialized library spaces (e.g., student research support).

Supportive "of" the Libraries; not supportive "for" the Libraries. Although recent participation of deans, alumni association, university press, and graduate school in our fundraising event, this is not sustained throughout the year.

Supportive, yes

The development officer frequently brings in other people because they always seem to find success with providing them another connection to the university.

The libraries have received many gifts that have been from donors who give to multiple areas, and many faculty give to the libraries. Some deans are more verbally supportive than others. But some have helped us get collections important to their faculty and students.

Vice president for alumni and development oversees all development departments on campus and meets with high-level donors.

Visits donors with and on behalf of the director of development. Writes stewardship letters, provides input as to areas of need and expertise. Participation has made a great impact on proposals awarded, cultivation, and stewardship. Donors and alumni appreciate the personal.

We work collaboratively with other schools and units across the campus to cultivate donors through shared events and solicit support for collections in conjunction with endowed chairs.

20. Are development officers from other colleges or units actively supportive of fundraising for the library? N=53

Yes	36	68%
No	17	32%

If yes, please describe their role and the results. N=33

Actively? Yes, if alums & donors indicate interest.

All of the development officers at the foundation are supportive of one another. They will provide leads to the development officer of the library, set up meetings for them when they are visiting out of town, and help strategize team solicitations.

Annual fund team or other school development teams based on donor interest.

As needed, depending upon nature of gift to campus unit that they oversee.

Central development regional major gifts officers are very helpful.

Central, regional, international, gift planning, annual fund

Collaborate with institutional advancement staff including major gift officers, gift planning, the annual fund, alumni relations, and corporate foundation relations.

Collaborations encouraged by the central development office. Examples: joint initiative for library fund to support an endowed chair; donor who expresses two distinct areas of interest—one of which is the libraries and the other of which is a college or other area of the university with a separate development officer.

Development officers collaborate with Libraries' LDO to make connections to donors when donors' interests align with the Libraries' purposes and goals.

DOs from other units are supportive if the gift is a joint gift for their unit, or if they are central major gift officers (not assigned to a unit). Collaboration has resulted in several major gifts ranging from \$25K to \$1million.

Fundraising officers across campus are collaborative and we generally work well together. In the past, we've had collaborations on major gifts (>\$25K) with two other units, and three similar collaborations are currently in the works.

Generally, development officers in the colleges recognize and appreciate that the Libraries support ALL students. Whenever possible, the Libraries and colleges collaborate on gifts. Collaboration is a critical component in addressing our donors' passion.

Honors college dean, mass communications dean, and current donor sharing with college of science

If they manage a donor who also gives to the library, it will be included as part of their strategy in some cases. Gifts have been secured by other gift officers to support the library that serves their college.

It is standard protocol to work closely with school/college/unit development officers on shared projects and services placed within the Libraries. The Libraries have developed close partnerships with schools/colleges/units for the purpose of fundraising together.

Joint solicitations for libraries and other units on campus

Officers from university advancement, as needed, e.g., for planned giving and bequests, annual giving, etc.

On occasion and when fundraising impacts colleges and the library. For example, our archives and special collections have significance for the deans in the colleges of social sciences, and humanities, and languages & literatures. We collaborate on fundraising when appropriate.

Only a handful of my colleagues work with me to secure gifts for both units. I feel I have to constantly make my case to be included as an option for support.

Particularly our central gift officers and our planned giving officers are very collaborative.

Planned giving officers

Prospect identification, cultivation, and stewardship

Some campus partnerships are in place. This is a growth area.

Some development officers will speak on behalf of the libraries when the opportunity arises. We also share information.

Some support the libraries themselves; some also refer prospects who are interested in supporting the libraries

Sometimes. Prospect managers may introduce UL to potential donors who have expressed interest in library.

The college DOs do not but major gifts are managed by senior director of development & alumni affairs at the central development offices at the foundation.

The development team assigned to the college of music helps us a bit on the side when they have time. That is the source of our .05 FTE.

The director of development for planned giving has been working collaboratively with the director of development for the Libraries. He has recently secured an endowment gift that will provide discretionary support for the Libraries.

They will direct potential donors to the library if appropriate.

Travel together to meet donors with multiple interests. Also call on libraries for donors interested in school history.

University regional major giving officers, university planned giving officers, university corporate and foundation officers

We are actively building a more collaborative fundraising environment at the university. Most folks are willing to partner and we try our best to be supportive of each other's areas. Joint visits are a common occurrence, as well as joint proposals.

Additional comments N=3

Major gift (regional) development officers actively solicit gifts on behalf of Libraries. Results are not separately tracked.

Overall the answer is no, however there is new leadership who is emphasizing collaboration so this may change. Currently, there are one or two colleges/units here on campus that are willing to collaborate and are supportive of libraries.

Unsure

LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT STAFF EVALUATION

Note: moves are defined steps that bring a prospect closer to a gift; visits are personal interactions with a prospect; pipeline reports are tools used to analyze which stage in the development process a donor might be in—identification, qualification, cultivation, solicitation, or stewardship.

21. For each measure below please indicate whether it is Not Important, Important, or Very Important for evaluating the performance of the chief/most senior LDO. Select NA if the measure is not used to evaluate their performance. Make one selection per row. N=51

Measure	Not Important	Important	Very Important	NA	N
Dollars raised	0	12	37	2	51
Number of visits	1	15	33	2	51
Number of asks/proposals	1	19	29	2	51
Number of gift closures	3	18	27	3	51
Overall dollar goal	0	22	26	3	51
Visits per month (or other period)	6	24	18	3	51
Number of qualified donors	7	22	16	6	51
Number of moves	15	18	8	10	51
Pipeline reports	15	19	8	8	50
Moves per month (or other period)	14	20	7	10	51
Assisting other units	16	21	3	11	51
Joint proposals	16	23	1	11	51
Other criteria	2	2	3	11	18
Total number of respondents	30	49	46	17	51

If you indicated above that other criteria are important or very important, please briefly describe the criteria. N=5

Number of prospects in portfolio

Number of submitted opportunities (proposals)

Since the library does not have specific alumni and serves the entire community, campus partnerships are essential in helping to build awareness and support. Give Day, Parents Weekend, Reunion Weekend are secured and we work regularly with Foundation Relations.

University-wide projects such as scholarships, campaigns, and total annual giving to institution

We are also measured by size of gift, number of gifts, and type of gift (cash or planned).

Additional comments N=8

Because development responsibilities are shared with the university endowment, not all criteria are applicable. Our role is primarily cultivation.

Development program at Libraries is still being developed in partnership with central development. Numerical metrics haven't been put in place, because potential is yet to be determined. The other university development directors are evaluated on all of these metrics, and we have plans to develop our own in time.

“Engagement activities” described as events whether internal to the library or external to other parts of the organization.

Evaluation criteria are determined by the foundation.

Little is evaluated other than dollars raised, visits, and proposals presented.

No LDO employed or evaluated by Libraries.

Submitted proposals and substantial donor contacts (e.g., donor visits) are strong indicators of success.

There is no LDO in the library; the UL is involved directly with donors.

22. For each measure below please indicate whether it is Not Important, Important, or Very Important for evaluating the performance of the library director. Select NA if the measure is not used to evaluate their performance. Make one selection per row. N=53

Measure	Not Important	Important	Very Important	NA	N
Dollars raised	4	24	16	9	53
Overall dollar goal	8	20	14	11	53
Number of gift closures	15	11	8	18	52
Number of visits	17	15	6	14	52
Number of qualified donors	14	15	5	17	51
Number of asks/proposals	20	13	4	15	52
Assisting other units	19	11	3	18	51
Visits per month (or other period)	20	14	2	16	52
Moves per month (or other period)	24	6	1	21	52
Number of moves	22	8	1	21	52
Joint proposals	22	10	1	18	51
Pipeline reports	25	7	0	19	51
Other criteria	2	0	5	14	21
Total number of respondents	31	41	24	25	53

If you indicated above that other criteria are important or very important, please briefly describe the criteria. N=5

3- and 5-year averages, Capital Campaign performance

Creating a culture of philanthropy

Strategic leadership to position the Libraries for sustainable fundraising. Aligning fundraising with Libraries highest priorities. Nurturing/mentoring her subordinates (i.e., retreats, skill-building, etc.)

The types of targets/initiatives used to attract fundraising dollars are almost as important as the actual money. For example, how do library targets help advance university strategic goals (through collections or buildings or endowed librarian positions, etc.)

The university librarian has an opportunity to build support across campus, with other deans and the office of research.

Additional comments N=5

“Engagement activities” described as events whether internal to the library or external to other parts of the organization.

Fundraising is an implicit responsibility of the Libraries dean. No formal numerical metrics are in place to evaluate dean’s performance, as potential for Libraries fundraising success is yet to be determined.

I'm not privy to the specifics regarding this evaluation, but I have been led to believe by the dean that dollars raised are important in his evaluation.

Recently, the library has collaborated on two major initiatives with entities outside the library. Our progress here will be an important measure of success.

The dean is not evaluated on fundraising to my knowledge.

- 23. For each measure below please indicate whether it is Not Important, Important, or Very Important for evaluating the performance of other professional library development staff. Select NA if the measure is not used to evaluate their performance. Make one selection per row. N=46**

Measure	Not Important	Important	Very Important	NA	N
Dollars raised	7	8	15	16	46
Overall dollar goal	9	10	10	17	46
Number of visits	10	7	12	17	46
Number of asks/proposals	11	6	13	16	46
Visits per month (or other period)	13	7	9	17	46
Number of gift closures	11	8	11	16	46
Moves per month (or other period)	13	11	3	19	46
Number of moves	14	10	3	19	46
Number of qualified donors	9	10	9	18	46
Joint proposals	13	13	2	18	46
Pipeline reports	12	12	3	19	46
Assisting other units	11	15	2	17	45
Other criteria	5	2	1	15	23
Total number of respondents	20	23	21	26	46

If you indicated above that other criteria are important or very important, please briefly describe the criteria. N=3

Donor and prospect research, completing fundraising reports, maintaining libraries' website platforms, preparing mailing list.

Quality of interaction with donors both on the phone and in person matters as does representing the Libraries as professional and supportive to the donor/prospects needs, wishes, and gifts.

Stewardship efforts and annual fundraising efforts are very important.

Additional comments N=6

Answers apply to development officer position, which differs from development coordinator position.

As there is no other professional library development staff, these are more hypothetical answers.

Development staff have varying roles.

No professional library development staff at the university.

Not to my knowledge.

Only major gift officers and high-level foundation/corporate relations officers have metrics.

24. Who conducts the evaluation of the chief/most senior LDO? Check all that apply. N=51

Library director	36	71%
Managerial personnel from institution's development unit	36	71%
Other position	3	6%

Please specify the other position N=3

Also, dotted reporting line to the central development office: vice president of philanthropy. In time, I believe there will be a more formal reporting line to the central office.

Dean of the college of music and AVC for advancement

Dotted reporting line to assistant provost for strategic engagement—arts and humanities

Additional comments N=13

Dean and senior VP for advancement

Dean of the library and the vice president of university advancement

Executive director (development); dean of university libraries

Executive director, DAE conducts the review with comments and feedback from the library director.

Foundation assistant vice president

Foundation management

Joint review with dean of libraries and assistant VP advancement

Jointly between library director and university foundation office

President of the foundation

The evaluation is done by my central development supervisor and the university librarian.

Vice chancellor for development

Vice president of development at the university foundation. Annual reviews by the vice provost of libraries and the vice president of development at the university foundation.

VP university development

25. Who conducts the evaluation of other professional library development staff? Check all that apply. N=38

Library Development Officer	27	71%
Managerial personnel from institution's development unit	8	21%
Library director	4	11%
Other position	8	21%

Please specify the other position N=8

Associate deans

Director of development, library

Director, libraries advancement

Executive assistant I

Foundation management

Other professional staff who help support library fundraising as part of larger or related assignments are evaluated by their supervisors within the university's alumni relations and development operation.

The administrative assistant II is over all of the admin assistants, so they have some part in the evaluation process of my development assistant.

We're in the process of hiring a development services coordinator who will report to the LDO.

LIBRARY COORDINATION WITH THE INSTITUTION'S DEVELOPMENT OFFICE

26. Is the library positioned and supported comparably to other units/schools/colleges in the institution in terms of fundraising opportunities? N=53

Yes	22	42%
No	31	59%

If no, please explain. N=26

Academic units and other priorities in the campaign receive greater support.

All of the other deans have assigned development teams except continuing education, which is on a different funding model.

But, we are working on that. We have a major renovation scheduled in the next few years, which will create some opportunities. The library hasn't been a top priority in the past mainly because it wasn't the "squeaky wheel." Now we are the "squeaky wheel."

Colleges get more self-identified donors.

Each of the colleges has an embedded academic advancement officer. While they report to central development administratively, they work closely with the dean and other leadership in their college to address college funding priorities. The libraries do not have an embedded academic advancement officer, but rather a development liaison from central development, with a limited percentage of time available for library activities.

I have no benchmarking study that would enable me to answer this question with any authority. Anecdotally (conversations with other library development staff through self-initiated contact or ALADN), it is not.

Libraries are new to development as being its own unit. It used to be considered a part of the college of arts and sciences. In addition, we are not considered as part of the principal gift strategies. This is because we are still developing our fundraising priorities.

Library is assigned very few highly rated prospects and doesn't have access to them yet; is assessed on "major gift productivity."

No natural constituency, so the library has to work collaboratively with colleagues to find prospects.

Only 20% assignment. All others are 100%.

Testing a new model with the senior DO embedded in the foundation and the DO embedded in the libraries. Previously it was comparable.

The Libraries are not seen as a priority within the current campaign by the current administration.

The Libraries do not have an alumni base similar to other schools, colleges, and units and do not have access to their donors and prospects.

The library does not have a development officer, nor is there a dedicated person or team at the central development office focused on the library.

The library is a small unit, so larger colleges receive more attention when it comes to fundraising.

The regional gift officers do not often think to bring up the libraries/archives/press when they are speaking with donors, as they might with the schools and colleges.

There is no direct pipeline to library donors other than previous donors to the library. As such, our donor numbers fall each year and will continue to do so until a solution is developed.

This “no” is qualified in that the university is adjusting its level of support for the Libraries through central advancement and principal gifts and the chancellor’s involvement. The Libraries come from a perennial condition of lacking in number and quality of major gift prospects.

Unlike the colleges and other units, I have no support staff and receive only a small fraction of the annual financial support provided by university advancement.

We are certainly supported, but in no way at the level of the colleges.

We are growing our program.

We do get easy access to good major gift prospects. Often we are given a prospect once the school feels they are done with them.

We do not have a clear constituency and often suffer from the fact that the university-wide traffic patterns in development favor organizations with alumni. Non-degree granting units have a more uphill battle to develop a donor pipeline and have to use creative methods to determine constituencies that have opted in.

We don’t have the support staff of other units, which pulls development staff away from primary roles.

We have a very limited number of LIS alumni and are not filling the pipeline.

We work regularly with some groups like alumni relations and the Parent Program. We need to break through to other department units and build more support since we have librarians and staff that support all academic units on campus.

Additional comment N=1

We are unable to solicit those who haven’t given to us previously, which puts us at a disadvantage to schools who are allowed to solicit all alumni.

27. How often is the chief/most senior LDO invited to participate in institutional-level meetings about major prospects? N=51

Occasionally	31	61%
Always	11	22%
Never	9	18%

28. How often is the library director invited to participate in institutional-level strategy meetings about fundraising? N=51

Occasionally	34	67%
Always	9	18%
Never	8	16%

29. How often is the library included on institution-level direct mail appeals as a possible gift designation? N=52

Occasionally	29	56%
Always	19	37%
Never	4	8%

30. Is the library included on the institution-level giving website as a possible gift designation? N=53

Yes	52	98%
No	1	2%
The institution does not provide online giving opportunities	0	—

31. How often is the library included as a possible gift designation during phone-a-thon solicitations conducted by the larger institution? N=52

Occasionally	32	62%
Always	16	31%
Never	2	4%
The institution does not conduct phone-a-thon solicitations	2	4%

32. Please indicate whether the institution’s central development operations or the library’s development office provides the more significant amount of staff effort for each of the following activities. N=53

Activity	Central Staff	Library Staff	N
Major gifts	14	39	53
Prospect research	48	5	53
Gift processing	41	12	53
Deferred/planned giving	35	18	53
Special events	8	45	53
Annual giving	30	22	52
Direct mail	31	21	52
Development communications	18	34	52
Records processing	49	3	52
Corporation/foundation relations	32	19	51
Information technology	35	15	50
Phone-a-thon	47	1	48
Other activities	3	4	7
Total number of respondents	53	50	53

If you selected other activity/central staff above, please briefly describe the activity. N=3

AG, DM, and phone: Library is responsible for content but central handles everything else.

Annual endowment reporting: central development compiles financial reports and combines documents; units provide individual fund impact reports to be included.

Some of our donor relations activities, such as the mailing of endowment reports to stewardees, is managed centrally. In many cases, I play a role of varying size with each of the items listed above as being managed by central staff.

If you selected other activity/library staff above, please briefly describe the activity. N=3

Donor cultivation, personal donor stewardship, and prospect identification

Gift stewardship (i.e., making sure funds are spent in accordance with donor intent and reporting to donors about use of funds) is a major ongoing responsibility of the libraries organization, involving the dean, the associate university librarians, numerous collection management and administrative support staff. This is especially the case with the 150+ separate endowment funds stewarded by the libraries. The central development operation also devotes significant time and trouble for gift stewardship on an institution-wide basis.

Our external relations team staff members support events and provide some support for development-related communications, such as thank you letters, event bios, etc.

Additional comments N=2

Our institution has a centralized annual giving office that manages phone and mail appeals. However, as an office of one, the chief LDO is still responsible for leadership annual gifts (<\$25K) to the library. Gift and record processing is also managed by the central office.

We create a UDEV form with each donation and it accompanies the donation that is processed at central development. We write a thank you letter for each donation from the university librarian; the donor relations team issues the tax donation letter.

33. Please indicate whether the institution's central development operations or the library's development office provides the more significant amount of funds for each of the following activities. N=52

Activity	Central Funds	Library Funds	N
Special events	9	43	52
Major gifts	19	32	51
Direct mail	28	23	51
Prospect research	46	5	51
Development communications	23	28	51
Gift processing	43	7	50
Deferred/planned giving	41	9	50
Corporation/foundation relations	39	11	50
Records processing	47	3	50
Annual giving	25	24	49
Phone-a-thon	39	10	49
Information technology	34	15	49
Other activities	1	3	4
Total number of respondents	51	48	52

If you selected other activity/central funds above, please briefly describe the activity. N=1

Donor relations

If you selected other activity/library funds above, please briefly describe the activity. N=3

Libraries provide the majority of funding for all donor engagement activities, e.g., exhibits, donor cultivation, etc.

The Libraries and each unit must provide its own marketing and communications funding. The Libraries provide the director of development salary.

Volunteer support, stewardship

Additional comment N=1

Records and gift processing are managed and paid centrally. Mail and phone are managed centrally, but the library is charged for the effort.

BOARDS, FRIENDS, AND ALUMNI ASSOCIATION SUPPORT

34. Please indicate which of the following groups exist at your institution and which support library development, either financially or through effort/advocacy. Check all that apply. N=51

Group	Exists	Supports financially	Supports through advocacy	N
Library Development Board	29	27	24	29
Library Friends Group	22	19	11	22
Alumni Association	40	3	14	40
Student Advisory Board	27	0	15	27
Other group	15	6	12	15
Total number of respondents	51	37	40	51

If you selected other group above, please briefly describe the group. N=15

Group exists N=2

Faculty advisory board

Library development board is under construction. It will exist, it will support financially, and will support through advocacy. Below answers are planned/projected.

Group exists, Supports financially N=1

Our Cabell Associates Board regularly supports the library with gifts to support programming.

Group exists, Supports through advocacy N=7

Faculty senate committee on the Libraries

Faculty senate library committee

Libraries alumni outreach group

Library advisory committee: a faculty senate committee made up primarily of faculty.

Library ambassadors: student group that volunteers to assist with library events/programs.

Library faculty advisory board

The university library committee is a group of mostly faculty, but some students, that meets several times a year to advise the dean. The hope is that members will also help by spreading positive information throughout campus.

Group exists, Supports financially and through advocacy N=4

History board

Librarian emeriti

Special collections advisory board

We have a library advisory council that I consider to be different than a library development board.

Additional comments N=3

Development board is called “Dean’s Advisory Council,” which is made up of community volunteers. We are working to grow a culture of giving within this group, but it’s not there yet. The affinity of the group isn’t in a great place either, as the former development office allowed the chair to unilaterally assemble the group using his personal network. They have affinity for the chair and not necessarily the Libraries. In the future, the dean will be solely responsible for adding members.

Our library administrative group meets with the leaders of the associated students (undergrads) and graduate students group annually. The library also implements and publishes an annual survey.

The first two groups do not exist and the other two do, but are not directly connected to fundraising for the library.

35. If there is a library development board, please indicate the number of members, their position titles, and their roles. N=31

Number	Position Titles	Roles on Board
1	Libraries Advisory Council, Member	Volunteer leadership, fundraising, friend raising, and advocacy
5	No titles specifically	Prospecting, awareness, connections
6	Committee Chair, Member	Advocacy, fundraising, contributors
7	Library Volunteer Leadership Committee	One chair plus six members
8	Advancement Board Member	Advocacy, donor, assist with fundraising, collaboration
9	Dean’s Cabinet Member	Advocate for a specified area within Archives and Special Collections through events that focus on each area of interest for the purpose of widening the number of individuals who support the Libraries. Members also make a major gift.

Number	Position Titles	Roles on Board
9	Board of Visitors Chair and members	Guide the advisory structure for the libraries, serve as ambassadors and positive representatives of the libraries, assist in securing private funding resources, contribute to the libraries through annual gifts of \$1,000 or more, familiarize with the library public programming, projects, and student activities.
10	Board of Visitors member	Currently being re-evaluated to be more of a fundraising board.
11	Chairperson and members of the board	Advocacy, philanthropic, professional expertise, and contact into Board of Trustees
12	Dean's Development Council Member	Support library through philanthropy, expertise, and advocacy
13	NA	Members
13	Advancement Council Member	1 chair, the rest are members
14	Member	Insight, advocacy, support
15	Dean's Advisory Council member. The lead volunteer is Chair.	Theoretically, to give \$1,000 to Dean's Excellence Fund and to advocate for the Libraries in various ways.
15	Chair, Vice chair, member	Give, advocate
19	President, Vice President	To advocate and support the Libraries
21	President, Vice President, Immediate Past President, all others are members	Fundraising, advocacy, networking
24	External board comprised of alumni with various career paths	Advisory
24	President and board members	Volunteer, advocate, financially support & promote the Libraries
24	President	Assist with raising funds and friends and advocating for the libraries.
27	Chair, Vice Chair @, Members	Communicate campaign goals, library objectives to alumni, friends, corporations, foundations. Make significant gift of \$100,000 or more. Assist in cultivation, stewardship, identification of prospects, provide guidance/ leadership to development staff.
28	Libraries Advisory Board Members	Advocacy, fundraising, annual contributions, campaign giving
28	Chair and members	Advising the dean, advocating for the libraries on the institutional level and philanthropic giving
28	Chair, Vice Chair, Membership Chair, Social Chair	
29	Advocates	Varies
32	Chair, Vice Chair, Committee Chair, Committee Vice Chair, Member	Suggesting ways to raise the Libraries' profile among the university's constituencies, identifying and securing financial resources, and bringing together the interests and expertise of a wide variety of supporters.

Number	Position Titles	Roles on Board
35	Chair; vice chair for nominations; vice chair for development; vice chair for programming	Recruitment of new members; meeting planning/agenda setting; brainstorming event ideas; advocating for library support from campus administration and from other alumni. In addition, all members of the board, except for a few lifetime membership honorees, need to be active, annual donors.
36	Chair or member	Advocacy, fundraising, referrals, support of university librarian
45	Chair, members	Serve as ambassadors for the university; provide valuable counsel & professional expertise; leverage their own networks in support of the university; financially support university priorities, including targeted initiatives related to the libraries.

Comments N=2

The board is on hold.

Tried to start one for campaign; not leadership or appetite.

36. Are the member’s appointment processes, terms, obligations, and other conditions comparable to those for development boards for other units/schools/colleges? N=31

Yes 26 84%

No 5 16%

Comments N=10

Answered Yes N=4

Required to make a gift, unclear if it is comparable to other units and colleges.

Some units. Others are so much larger they have multiple boards with various levels and functions (i.e., business school).

The volunteer board structure and membership process, including adding new members, is managed by central advancement and the chancellor’s office.

Unsure. We have not compared notes with other campus units about this.

Answered No N=5

Giving requirement is much less.

Not all units have a Friends group.

There is no consistency between the unit/school/colleges advisory groups.

Varies across campus.

We do not require a financial contribution—just a suggestion.

37. Does your development program engage in activities that you would characterize as “friend raising,” defined as efforts intended to generate committed and supportive relationships with outside parties and entities without a specific fundraising purpose or goal? N=49

Yes	38	78%
No	11	22%

If yes, please describe the activities. N=30

Annual celebration of university authors (includes alumni authors), dean’s lecture on information & society, author readings & literary events

Community-oriented programs/events

Coordinating events with the alumni association throughout the year

Cultivation events, one-on-one visits

Events and exhibits

Events to generate “buzz” for the libraries.

Events, presentations, lectures, holiday parties

Exhibit opening, host for board meetings, collaboration with other units on events

Exhibition openings and catalogue mailings, endowed lectures, screenings and panel discussions

Friends of the Libraries and Friends of the Panama Canal Museum Collection

Friends of the Libraries used to host author events for the university and community.

LDO is member of local Rotary for the purpose of friend-raising. We aim to host quarterly socials for Friends of the Libraries for the purposes of friend-raising.

Lectures, celebrations (year-long 50th anniversary celebration of our main library), Day of Giving

Major and small events, dinners

Many programs created and presented within and by the Libraries target the community and people as a form of “friend raising” including parents, grandparents, and extended family members of students as a way of developing potential opportunities from the community and the extend families of students.

Offering events that promote collections and collaborations; partnerships with faculty and students

Open houses and community engagement

Our Friends of the Libraries offers many events throughout the year to engage the public.

Programs and events at library; participation in university-wide events; publication of a quarterly magazine targeted toward Friends of the Library members and current or potential library supporters.

Public events: lectures, programs, exhibits

Reaching out to prospective donors who have expressed interest in donating to the library, not necessarily in the near future but through posthumous gifts, etc.

Recruiting possible new members

Special events

Special events, lectures, and tours

Tailgates, food handouts during finals week, meetings between donors and scholarship recipients

Thank donors, introduce prospects to libraries, invite to events, share business cards with prospects.

We are constantly building the network to hopefully connect with those that can connect us with financial support. Additionally, we aim to connect our friends with new projects that may lead to their financial support.

We have an annual dinner and regular other events like faculty lectures.

We have recently revamped our Friends of the Library program and there are a number of events being held to attract the interest of community members.

We plan a fall and spring meeting for our development board, send letters of appreciation for every gift received by the libraries (in addition to the tax acknowledgment letter sent by the university), and send Christmas cards to library endowment donors and other significant benefactors.

Additional comment N=1

Note that the board does sponsor lectures and other activities that are open to the larger community and that have the effect of raising general awareness and positive community feeling about the library. However, that is not the purpose or goal of the board's participation.

DONOR COMMUNICATIONS

Donor communications include print or electronic communications and or solicitations that may include library stories, statistics, and other measures used to convey library value/success.

38. Please indicate which types of communications with potential donors are distributed in print and which are distributed electronically. Check all that apply. N=53

Communication Type	Print	Electronic	N
Solicitation letters	47	35	50
Stewardship letters	50	21	50
Informal communication (i.e., birthday cards)	42	20	45
Newsletters	27	37	42
Magazines	28	15	31
Other donor communication	20	20	23
Total number of respondents	53	49	53

If you selected other donor communication/print above, please briefly describe it. N=19

Annual report

Annual report and web news item

Annual report, holiday card, calendar, special event invitations, periodic updates, library public programming brochure

Annual reports

Collateral handouts both in print and electronic formats

Created a donor book based on an Instagram series of photographs called People of Ekstrom Library. The original series included photos of students and libraries' personnel along with short statements about the subject's relationship to the library. The book focuses on students from all the libraries.

Endowment impact reports

Event Information/Invitations

Event invitations

Event invitations, annual reports

Impact report for annual fund donors

Impact report: akin to annual report, but without any financial information. Includes highlights of the year and infographics on various metrics.

Information packets, event invitations

Personal emails and hand written notes

Proposals

Thank you letters/acknowledgments

The Libraries annual report is posted online and mailed to all donors.

We create specific brochures and pamphlets that highlight specific collections, tech needs, projects to leave behind with donors/prospects.

We have recently added an annual report that is available online.

If you selected other donor communication/electronic above, please briefly describe it. N=16

Annual report, special event invitations, periodic updates, library public programming brochure

Blogs, Facebook, tweets

Donor gift press release

Electronic birthday cards are sent monthly and an electronic magazine featuring collections, technology & research debuts in Fall 2018 (called SOURCE).

Endowment impact reports

Event information/invitations

Event invitations

Our library communicates manager is in charge of the library's social media channels. I share some of our posts with specific donors.

Proposals

Social media, email updates (personal messages to advocates apart from e-newsletters)

Thank you letters/acknowledgments

The annual report of the library includes major accomplishments, our strategic plan, and other use and collections related data.

The Libraries annual report is posted online and mailed to all donors.

There is a PDF of the book online.

Updates on key library initiatives, activity, grants, etc. are sent to our development board electronically on an as needed basis.

We have recently added an annual report that is available in limited quantities in print.

39. What quantitative measures of library outcomes and performance, beyond metrics or statistics like gate counts, are used in these communications? N=39

5,000 hours of preparation and instruction for more than 15,000 students, number of reference requests, textbooks loaned, equipment loaned, results of satisfaction survey, budget numbers

A few examples include library public programming counts and attendance, number of print and electronic titles, digital collection geographic reach, linear feet of acquired special collections, expenditures, reference services to students and faculty.

All email/mailed communications are added to constituent records in our CRM. Web communications track opens, forwards, clicks.

ARL stats

Campaign progress numbers

Click rates

Coded return envelopes are included with each mailing enabling the tracking of dollars raised per mailing.

Comparison of our gate count to our organizations (e.g., the Public Library); number of technology checkouts (e.g., laptops, chargers, video equipment, etc.); cups of coffee sold at our cafe, etc.

Data gathered for internal purposes, such as gate count, count of students receiving information literacy instruction or receiving help through consultations, satisfaction with the library website, collection metrics, and other metrics are shared with donors and potential donors as relevant.

Data related to collections, print and digital, circulation, ILL, gate counts, etc.

Dollars raised, event statistics

Dollars raised, number of donors, event participation

Dollars saved by students on textbook purchases as a result of our OER grants program.

Endowment and gift stewardship reports for gifts intended for collections frequently include counts or lists of titles purchased.

For some electronic mailings, we can measure the number of "opens."

Fundraising totals

Gate counts, budgets, visits by non-campus user groups

Giving honor rolls, campaign numbers and goals, quantitative assessment survey responses, etc.

ILL requests

Infographic with various usage statistics on specific project outcome

Mostly gate counts and material/book counts. We have used information on a current study of students taking courses offered by the libraries.

None at this time (2 responses)

Number of computers, study rooms, equipment for checkout, scholarships

Number of donors, dollars raised, number of items in collections

Open rate for electronic communications

Open rates and segmentation of list. Looking at what emails were read by whom, what events were attended by whom, if they gave or took action to help the library.

Our annual report includes comprehensive yearly statistics for the Libraries, including service stats, collection stats, and giving.

Philanthropic giving, research funding

Progress of strategic goals and initiatives financials

Progress towards specific campaign goals including annual and capital

Space-related data such as seat counts; resource-related data such as numbers of online journals, databases, ebooks, print books, etc.

Student enrollment in the library courses and instruction pass rates. Faculty participation in the institution digital repository.

The impact of various library activities and donor funds.

The quantitative measures of library outcomes and performances that we use in development communications are typically infographics that accompany pieces like end-of-year letters and our university capital campaign case statement.

Total of event attendance, volume count, materials expenditures, etc.

We list all donors—GIK and \$—in the annual report. We do not list the amount per person, just the names. We include all library endowment accounts as well.

We occasionally include quantitative measures in stewardship letters, relating specifically to the area in which the gift was given. As we are in the midst of a fundraising campaign for library renovation, metrics such as gate counts may be relevant to a donor at this time.

Web traffic in catalogue and digital library. Number of dissertations submitted to our digital repository for undergraduate and graduate students. Number of classes taught in the library or by subject librarians. Number of liaison classroom presentations hosted by librarians.

40. What types of quantitative measures of library outcomes and performance would you use if they were available? N=25

Amount of research published from collections

Attendance at events (donors)

Baseline of giving from other libraries, retention rates, etc. Amount of other emails donors receive from other colleges, schools, units, etc.

Clicks for electronic communications, replies to solicitation letters, and visits to library website

Impact assessments related to learning

In discussion with assessment librarian to determine.

Indicators of the libraries' impact on student success

It depends on the purpose of the solicitation and the audience.

Library usage by discipline, major, school/college

Measuring success...higher grade points

Not sure

Number of donors, increasing percentage of gifts, dollar totals from specific campaigns

Other quantitative measures we would use if we had access to them would be analytics of how these communications caused our constituents to act. Did a certain piece trigger a donation, attendance at

an event, etc.? Additionally, we would find useful any direct evidence that links library interaction to student success.

Progress towards specific campaign goals including annual and capital as well as qualitative assessment of general collecting areas that might be relevant to interests expressed by prospects and donors.

Research studies showing evidence of library programs, services, and instruction making a significant difference in students' lives and in faculty members' research, as applicable.

Return on Investment on various solicitation methods

Statistics about use of library by alumni

Student and faculty survey as to improved information literacy. Number of non-student library card holders. Usage data by faculty accessing scholarly record: How many articles and journals is each unit accessing for research every semester?

Student data: impact on GPA, retention, etc. when participating in library instruction and programming.

Student success surveys, retention measures

Study room checkouts (I can probably get this), hours of library use per student, average number of visits per week, etc.

These are usually connected to accomplishments as they relate to the strategic plan/direction.

Use of electronic resources by constituency. Email conversion rates: how many donors come from the library and university stories about the library?

We'd like to be able to measure impact of research consultation program on student success outcomes.

What's out there? What do others use?

41. What qualitative measures of library outcomes and performance are used in these communications? N=33

Accomplishments of faculty and staff, library efforts to help with student retention such as information literacy assessment results, impact of spaces and services, positive comments on social media

Anecdotal evidence from students and faculty who have received big benefits from working with library.

Anecdotal impact stories, donor stories

Communications often discuss goals and projects conducted to meet them, impact on students, profiles of scholarship awardees, news of librarian accomplishments, and other anecdotal evidence of the Libraries' performance.

Direct feedback from donors and event attendees

Donor stories, library success stories, introductions to new faculty and staff, student success stories

Features on faculty research, reflections on past success, looking ahead

How funds are spent and the impact on students/faculty/research.

Impact of giving: students supported, spaces created, faculty and researcher highlights, student research highlights, programs offered.

Impact on teaching, learning, and research

Impact stories on how the Libraries have made a difference.

None at this time

Number of visitors annually, count of articles accessed electronically, number of questions answered annually.

Photos, if applicable, and narratives that describe the accomplishment or endeavor that was innovative or of interest.

Progress towards specific campaign goals including annual and capital

Quotes from donors, students, faculty, staff expressing satisfaction with libraries

Quotes from students, faculty, and librarians about impact of gifts

Regular updates of library initiatives and projects

Retweets, Facebook sharing, social media interactions, and event attendance

Special collections news, new acquisitions information, new services at the Libraries, updates on the construction and progress of our new library, library public programming, awards, grants received, staff accomplishments, donor information, etc.

Special projects, “big news,” student or faculty successes

Stories from library users: student, faculty, alums

Stories indicating student support. Examples of exhibits, events, and activities involving students and faculty in the libraries

Stories of direct impact to students, faculty and staff collaborations within and outside the campus community

Stories about renovation, services, accomplishments, impact on users, and open access.

Student and faculty testimonials of Libraries experience. Stories from across the libraries regarding collections.

Student and faculty testimonials

Student interviews and profiles; donor profiles and testimonials

The qualitative measures of library outcomes and performance that we use in development communications are typically anecdotal stories of student and faculty success.

Type of research, collection content, space renovations

We include quotes from users regarding new spaces or services, most often in stewardship letters related to renovation fundraising.

We often use donor quotes in proposals and editorial stories about major gifts/new endowments.

We use “success stories” from faculty and students about use of collections and services.

42. What types of qualitative measures of library outcomes and performance would you use if they were available? N=16

Administration comments or input

Connection between library impact and student success

Feedback from donors

How do the qualities of an event or the content of the invitations affect attendees’ giving?

Impact stories

In discussion with assessment librarian to determine.

It depends on the purpose of the solicitation and the audience.

More data from usability studies, student focus groups, etc.

Other qualitative measures we would use if we had access to them are more stories like these, but, in addition, the results of stories like these. Do these experiences help researchers procure more funding? Do these experiences make students more successful? In the graduate school or job markets?

Progress towards specific campaign goals including annual and capital as well as qualitative assessment of general collecting areas that might be relevant to interests expressed by prospects and donors.

Quotes from donors, students, faculty, staff, and library community; feedback on library services

Student quotes

Survey results, reader panels, focus groups

These are also measured against the strategic directions: how have we succeeded in these directions and what progress has been made?

We need an easier, more systematic way to identify the success stories mentioned above.

We need more specific testimonials from students. Would love video content to share in e-communications. Would love more images of Libraries community for communications, depicting scholarship, group learning, librarian-student interaction. Stories from librarians as to specific ways they've enabled scholarship and research projects in the lives of students and faculty.

43. Are the library's commitment to or contributions to intellectual freedom explicitly used, described, or discussed in your communications with stakeholders, including the inclusion of the library's intellectual freedom statement? N=50

Yes	22	44%
No	28	56%

Comments N=10

Answered Yes N=6

In newsletter when we include mission, vision, core values.

In strategic directions printed brochures & online

Not typically part of fundraising communications, but are used in other communications when appropriate

Particularly support for open access

Programming for Freedom to Read Week each year, included on library website.

The Libraries support and advocate for intellectual freedom through our open access publishing fund, affordable textbook project, information tables, workshops, and more.

Answered No N=4

It is included in the gift agreement form.

Not especially. We could do better.

Not explicitly

Unless it becomes necessary.

44. Are the library's commitment to or contributions to inclusion and diversity explicitly used, described, or discussed in your communications with stakeholders, including the inclusion of the library's diversity or inclusion statement? N=50

Yes	37	74%
No	13	26%

Comments N=9

An inclusion and diversity statement appears on all printed and electronic publications, implemented FY2018.

As a state institution we must state this in all communications and furthermore, we must make all our communications ADA compliant.

But in the form of examples

Explicitly stated in library's strategic plan.

In newsletter when we include mission, vision, core values.

In strategic directions printed brochures & online

In the strategic plan

On the web site

Yes, when appropriate.

45. Do the library's communications professionals or unit report through the library development office? N=51

Yes	8	16%
No	42	84%

If no, where do they report? N=31

Associate Dean/Libraries Administration

Associate Director for Business Administration

AUL, Administrative Services

Both communications and development report to the associate dean.

Communications professionals used to report to the development officer, but were recently moved out of the department and now report to the university librarian.

Dean (5 responses)

Dean's Office (2 responses)

Deputy Chief Librarian

Deputy Director of Libraries

Director of communications reports to university librarian.

Libraries administration. While there is coordination, Libraries communications selects and advises on development projects.

Marketing and communication work group is part of the University Libraries organization, whereas library development reports through centralized university development operation.

No, but I've tried explaining that in other development programs that under advancement is fundraising, events and outreach, and communications. Communications reports directly to dean.

Operations

Senior Director of Administrative & Financial Services

Team Leader for Planning, Budgets and Assessment

The communications unit reports to the dean of libraries.

The director of communications and marketing is a direct report to the dean of libraries.

The library does not have the benefit of communications professionals at present.

They report directly to the dean but work closely with Libraries Development and Advancement as part of the communications and advancement plans.

They were recently absorbed into the central communications team.

Through the library administrative office

To an associate university librarian

To the director of our marketing & communications group

We do not have a library development office. Our communications professionals report to the university librarian.

We meet on a regular basis. The communications manager reports to the AUL for outreach.

Additional comments N=2

Director of communications reports to the dean of the libraries. .50 FTE social media specialist reports to the director of communications.

We do not have a communications professional for the library so this is not applicable.

CAPITAL CAMPAIGN

46. What was the university's or parent institution's goal during the most recent or current capital campaign? N=50

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	N
75,000,000	6,000,000,000	1,998,333,333	1,500,000,000	45

Comments N=5

Established by the foundation

Not publicly disclosed

TBD

This was not solely a capital campaign. The campaign was centered around the 125th anniversary of the university and funding priorities.

We are beginning the first university campaign now.

47. If that campaign has concluded, please indicate the total that was raised. N=24

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	N
275,000,000	6,400,000,000	1,928,650,000	1,462,000,000	20

Comments N=4

At least \$860 million has been raised in this campaign thus far.

Ends June 2020.

Has not concluded, but goal has been exceeded.

We are about 85% of the way there with two years remaining.

48. What was the library's overall stated goal during the most recent or current capital campaign?

N=43

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	N
1,000,000	240,000,000	29,204,651	20,000,000	43

49. How and by whom was the library capital campaign goal established? N=44

Advancement & library dean

Advancement and library leadership

Associate dean in consultation with the dean

Associate university librarian for development

By the VP of university advancement

By university development, the office of strategic planning, and the office of the budget, in consultation with university executive leadership, informed by the Libraries' strategic plan and key funding priorities.

Central development (2 responses)

Dean and LDO

Dean of libraries was consulted but the goal was established by the university foundation.

Dean of the library and director of development in consultation with the volunteer leadership committee

Dean of university libraries & central development

Dean, board, director of library development, VP for alumni relations and development all participated.

Dean, director-advancement, senior VP advancement

Development unit

Director of advancement

Director of development & executive director

Director of development, library

Executive director, university advancement

Former dean of libraries and libraries development officer

Foundation

Jointly by the foundation, university senior administration, and the Libraries dean

Jointly foundation and Libraries

Jointly with central development

LDO, chief librarian, and division of university advancement

LDO, library director

Libraries and central fundraising leadership

Libraries in consultation with the endowment

Library and central

Library dean and institutional advancement staff

Library director and development

Library executive team: AULs

Provost and IA

The dean of libraries collaborated with the central development office and the LDO to set the goal.

The director of philanthropy/chief LDO

The university librarian at the time

University advancement

University central

University Foundation

University foundation and library? I wasn't here and can't say for certain.

University librarian

University librarian and library director of development and MG

University librarian, external advisory council, provost, president

Via the university administration, largely the president's cabinet

50. Is there a specific distinction in the goals for gifts, pledge payments, and matching gifts, pledges, and gifts in kind? N=49

Yes 9 18%

No 40 82%

If yes, please briefly describe the difference in goals. N=7

\$4,000,000 for building projects, \$1,000,000 for Library of the Future Endowment, \$1,000,000 for Special Collections and Archives Endowment

Cash and GIK are counted as cash; pledges are planned gifts or multi-year gifts.

Commitments and collections

Each is tracked but overall goal is not divided.

Pledge payments do not count towards goal.

University’s campaign progress to date includes gifts in kind, but LDO’s performance is assessed only on financial results.

We want to increase monetary giving through pledges, outright gifts, and matching gifts while reducing the percentage of giving that is made by non-monetary giving.

Additional comment N=1

There was an estimate of \$2 million in planned gifts. That goal has been exceeded.

51. Was there a goal that excluded gifts-in-kind? N=49

Yes 5 10%
 No 44 90%

If yes, what was that “cash” goal? N=4

\$10 million
 \$25 million
 \$65 million

The \$6,000,000 is our stated goal for the campaign and it is all for the purposes described above. However, the university counts and reports all gifts to the library (including in-kind donations) in our campaign total.

Additional comments N=3

But when we received a \$5 million gift-in-kind, dean requested a \$5 million increase in the Libraries goal.

For section below, totals: The university includes in-kind with a category called “gifts, grants, and pledges.” Thus my in-kind total is a conservative estimate based on a single, large gift I’m aware of (there are likely more I don’t know about). Where is the category for revocable gifts? The pledges box reflects our REVOCABLE total (I can’t use that category for pledges as the university includes pledges in the first total).

We are counting GIK values into the goal over \$5000.

52. If the library’s capital campaign has concluded, please indicate the totals that were raised. N=16

Category	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	N
Gifts, pledge payments, and matching gifts	1,635,000	47,642,496	15,389,887	6,900,000	5
Pledges	3,000,000	50,000,000	27,189,338	27,878,676	4
Gifts in kind	865,000	49,000,000	14,945,983	4,959,466	4
Total	2,771,940	77,000,000	23,676,522	10,000,000	13

Comments on Gifts, pledge payments, and matching gifts N=3

Close to \$50 million at this point
 Not concluded but have exceeded \$28 million at this time.
 Not concluded; currently at \$20 million

GIFTS IN KIND (GIK)

53. For GiK donations, do you have an established practice or policy requiring development officers to explicitly request, encourage, or require cash gift(s) for processing or other costs? N=51

Yes, request/encourage	34	67%
Yes, require	1	2%
No	16	31%

54. Over the last five years, on average what percentage of annual giving is from GiK? Enter a whole number without a % sign. N=44

Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	N
1%	85%	30.32%	25%	37

Comments N=7

Don't know—can't separate from total

I don't know the answer to this, but I am working with Special Collections to create more transparency in terms of rare book donations and manuscript donations. We are working to establish a policy and formal communication plan.

Information is not specifically tracked.

Minimal

Unknown—GIK donations not often appraised or included in fundraising metrics.

Very small; sometimes appraised estate gifts

We don't have a good valuation process, so cannot answer.

BUILDING PROJECTS

55. Has your library recently concluded or is it in the planning phase of a new building or major renovation? N=52

Yes	40	77%
No	12	23%

If yes, is the project part of a capital campaign? N=40

Yes	15	38%
No	14	35%
Not yet, but it will be	11	28%

56. What is the expected final cost of the project and what is the percentage of total cost for which the library is responsible? For the percentage, enter a whole number without a % sign. N=31

Cost	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	N
Final cost	1,000,000	200,000,000	52,962,903	38,000,000	31
Library %	3	100	66.5	85	20

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

57. Please enter any additional information regarding development activities at your library that may assist the authors in accurately analyzing the results of this survey. N=13

A professional Libraries development program has been in existence for only 15 years leaving the Libraries without an established group/history of principal and major gifts directed to the Libraries. Significant improvement in consideration and support by the chancellor and principal gifts is fostering growing success for the future of Libraries advancement.

At our institution, we have a strong central development department. While the Libraries partner with them and do everything we can to support their efforts, our role in development activity is much more limited than the type of things described in the survey. We have answered the questions as best we could to provide the perspective of an organization with this structure.

Canadian institutions are more limited than US counterparts in parent fundraising due to privacy legislation. GiK federal guidelines are different in Canada than in the US.

During our current capital campaign, 45% of major gifts have been planned gifts, 39% of major gifts have been gifts-in-kind, and 17% have been outright gifts.

Library director of development & alumni affairs position is currently vacant. Historically, the position was responsible for major gifts. We are currently moving to a model where the senior director of development & alumni affairs who reports to the central development office will be responsible for major gifts. The LDO is responsible for fund/friend-raising and is located at the libraries.

Many of our endowment-level donors were giving back in the 90s, and are no longer active in their philanthropy or are deceased. We also had a couple of very big university donors give in the 90s or early 2000s, who were not properly acknowledged and/or stewarded by the former dean. So, they've moved on to other units at the university. We're actively trying to repair those ties. We're completely rebuilding our major giving program. Most of our 60–70 annual donors are giving at under \$1000. Our strategy this year is to build a relationship with those annual donors and ask them at the end of the year to increase to the annual leadership level of above \$1000. We would like to see them give at the leadership level a handful of times before we propose a major gift to the Libraries. Statistically, donors make 10–15 gifts on the non-major giving level before they are “ready” to make a major gift. It's a time-consuming process. We do have a very active Friends of the Libraries group, but they historically do not see themselves as donors. They are more of a volunteer group (this is of course problematic). We are working to shift that culture a bit. Most of that group are retirees, so we are also working to grow the Friends community and invite more young professionals in. Sorry for any holes in this survey. Next year, there will likely be a clearer picture at the Libraries in terms of development. Thanks for all you do!

Not all campaigns are capital (i.e., buildings). The two campaigns I've been involved at have been comprehensive campaigns (i.e., people, places, and programs). Also, I wish you had asked the same questions about Friends groups as you did about development boards, I think you may have missed a lot of valuable information there. Our Friends group has some responsibilities that overlap with development (but we don't have a separate development board). And finally, I believe in libraries, and in an academic setting, the role of the library is essential. Despite our vital role in fostering academic excellence for students and innovative research among faculty, we are not a perennial priority—strategically, philanthropically, or physically. Libraries should be the easiest fundraising job on campus, but instead it's the hardest. I am aghast that university administration—people with PhDs who demonstrably benefited from academic libraries—doesn't see our inherent value in undergirding the entire institution. I understand that there are many competing priorities at all universities, but it's a fact that great universities have great libraries. As a development officer, it is part of my job to make the case for the library. I would like to see ARL develop some persuasive and compelling materials that would

help library deans make the case for the libraries with university presidents and their administrations. That could help us all a lot. Thank you.

Some of these questions aren't quite a fit. \$contributed income + \$appraised gifts v. budgets + FTE would be great to see a list of income compared to size/library budgets.

The institute has not permitted the library to hire a development officer. This has been a major constraint in expanding library collections, spaces, services, and other resources. With a large building project currently underway our hope is that more development attention will be paid to the library, commensurate with the norm at other ARL institutions.

The library new building and renovation project completed in January 2016. We have doubled the amount of use by our students, faculty, staff, and community. We are a great campus partner and look forward to more collaborations and donor support.

The Libraries is one of many units across campus with special collections, all of which have their own separate fundraising arm.

We are evolving in our development activities but to truly be successful need more willingness and inclusion from our university. With a recent change in leadership we are hopeful that this is on the horizon.

We have had a development office in place for roughly six years. In 1999, we completed a major capital campaign project for the main library on campus. Between 2000 and 2011, we had many years of either no development officer or one for a very short period. 2011 marks the beginning of our current fundraising program in earnest.

Responding Institutions

University of British Columbia
Brown University
University at Buffalo, SUNY
University of California, Irvine
University of California, Santa Barbara
Case Western Reserve University
University of Colorado at Boulder
Colorado State University
Cornell University
University of Delaware
Duke University
University of Florida
Florida State University
Georgetown University
Georgia Institute of Technology
University of Hawai'i at Manoa
University of Houston
Indiana University Bloomington
University of Iowa
Iowa State University
Johns Hopkins University
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
Louisiana State University
University of Louisville
McGill University
University of Maryland
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of Michigan
Michigan State University
University of Nebraska—Lincoln
University of New Mexico
New York University
North Carolina State University
Northwestern University
University of Notre Dame
Ohio University
Oklahoma State University
University of Oregon
Pennsylvania State University
University of Pittsburgh
Purdue University
University of Rochester
Rutgers University
Simon Fraser University
Syracuse University
Temple University
University of Tennessee
University of Texas at Austin
Texas A&M University
University of Toronto
Tulane University
Vanderbilt University
University of Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth University
Virginia Tech
University of Washington
Washington State University
University of Wisconsin—Madison
Yale University