



SPEC Kit 297

Library Development
December 2006

Karlene Noel Jennings

Director of Library Development
The College of William and Mary

Jos Wanschers

Development Officer, MIT Libraries
Massachusetts Institute of Technology



ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Series Editor: Lee Anne George

SPEC Kits are published by the


Association of Research Libraries
21 Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-1118
P (202) 296-2296 F (202) 872-0884
[http://www.arl.org/spec/
pubs@arl.org](http://www.arl.org/spec/pubs@arl.org)

ISSN 0160 3582

ISBN 1-59407-713-4

Copyright © 2006

This compilation is copyrighted by the Association of Research Libraries. ARL grants blanket permission to reproduce and distribute copies of this work for nonprofit, educational, or library purposes, provided that copies are distributed at or below cost and that ARL, the source, and copyright notice are included on each copy. This permission is in addition to rights of reproduction granted under Sections 107, 108, and other provisions of the US Copyright Act.

 The paper used in this publication meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) Permanence of Paper for Publications and Documents in Libraries and Archives.

SURVEY RESULTS

Executive Summary.....	11
Survey Questions and Responses	17
Responding Institutions.....	74

REPRESENTATIVE DOCUMENTS

Mission Statements

University of Missouri	
MU Libraries Development Mission Statement.....	78
Southern Illinois University Carbondale	
Morris Library Development Office	79

Organization Charts

University of California, Santa Barbara	
UCSB Library Organization Chart	82
University of Florida	
Organization Chart	83
University of Illinois at Chicago	
UIC University Library Organization Chart	86
University of Virginia	
Library Development.....	87
University Library Interim Administration Organization Chart.....	88
Yale University	
Yale University Libraries Organizational Chart.....	89

Position Descriptions

University of California, Irvine
Development Director, UCI Libraries..... 92

University of California, Santa Barbara
Director of Library Development and Outreach 95

George Washington University
Director of Advancement, The Gelman Library System 98

Johns Hopkins University
Senior Associate Director of Development 99

University of Manitoba
Libraries Major Gifts Officer 100

University of Missouri
Director of Development-MU Libraries 106

Vanderbilt University
Director of Communications and Development 108

Evaluation Forms

Purdue University
University Advancement Performance Feedback System for Administrative
and Professional Staff..... 112

Budgets

University of Missouri
Development Budget..... 116

Purdue University
Purdue Libraries Advancement Budget FY 2005–06..... 117

Library Gift Materials Policies

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Gifts Policies and Procedures..... 122

University of Missouri
Policy on Acquiring Value Gift Material 128

University of Saskatchewan
Gifts-In-Kind—Guidelines for Donors 134

Projects

University of California, Santa Barbara
Library Needs and Special Projects 138

University of Houston
Library Building Project 139

Iowa State University
The Women in Chemistry Oral History Project..... 140

SELECTED RESOURCES

Books, Journals, and Articles 143

SPEC Kits 144

Web Sites 144



SURVEY RESULTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

The term “library development” conjures several different meanings for library professionals. For some, library development refers to the building of library collections; for others, it is any activity related to building the library, itself. For the purposes of this survey, library development referred to the strategic raising of financial support to benefit the needs and priorities related to programs, facilities, projects, and services within a research library. Over the past twenty years, library development has become increasingly more specialized. Depending upon the institution, library development can include annual giving, major giving, deferred giving, corporation and foundation relations (of which grant writing may be a component), public (and/or external) relations, event management, and other services.

Presently, the library community does not well understand what structures and resources are necessary for a successful library development program and how this library development program fits in the institution’s overall development structure and within the library leadership. This survey was designed to investigate the staffing, reporting relationships, and duties of library development programs in ARL member libraries. The results of this survey provide a snapshot of library development programs in research libraries and provide a baseline for institutions as they work to create, refine, or advocate for library development programs in their institutions.

This survey sought to determine and document the staffing, structure, and institutional relationship with respect to fundraising rather than fundraising production of member libraries. It is important to note that the authors knowingly excluded questions concerning the actual dollars raised for several key reasons. The most fundamental reason was the various manners and methods by which institutions count funds (whether cash or deferred; expendable, endowed or other; pledges or dollars received) and the fact that an adequate survey instrument could not be designed to accurately capture all possibilities. Nonetheless, the data do provide a lens through which a “typical” research library development program may be viewed.

Background

The survey was distributed to the 123 ARL member libraries in March 2006. Ninety libraries (73%) responded to the survey. Eighty-three (92%) reported that they have a formal library development program. Of those institutions, all have a fundraising professional assigned to the program, 76 (92%) use printed giving materials, 71 (86%) use direct mail, 50 (60%) conduct a phonathon, 50 (60%) have a friends organization, and 47 (57%) raise more than \$500,000 a year in private support.

The survey asked respondents who had a minimum of three of the following components to complete the questionnaire: a fundraising professional assigned to raise money for the library, printed giving materials, direct mail on behalf of the library’s

fundraising priorities, a phonathon on behalf of the library's fundraising priorities, a friends of the library organization, or a history of private support in excess of \$500,000 per year. Eighty respondents met this criterion.

Respondents were asked to indicate when the library development program began based on the hiring date of the first library development officer (LDO) whether full- or part-time. The 74 responses ranged across 30 years. The earliest was in 1975 (which coincidentally is the year after SPEC Kit 6: *Friends of the Library Organizations* was published) and 11 were created between then and 1984. There was a surge in the number of new programs between 1985 and 1999 with spikes in 1990 and 1995 (seven new programs in each of those years). A few new programs have begun each year since then, including one in 2006.

One of the ever-present critical questions within library development is which possible donor prospect pools can be approached on behalf of the library. The majority of survey respondents have unlimited access to current and lapsed library donors, current and retired library employees, and unaffiliated prospects; most have at least limited access to 12 other categories of potential donors that range from donors to other parts of the institution, to current students, faculty, and staff, to alumni, to non-donors. What is surprising is that 15 of 79 respondents (19%) have only limited access to current or lapsed fiscal year library donors and one reports never having access to these two groups. Only 11 libraries have unlimited access to both undergraduate and graduate alumni; six never have access to either group. Respondents have the least access to current students, their parents/grandparents, parents/grandparents of alumni, and university trustees. Access appears to be more freely given to institution non-donors—68 of 77 respondents (88%) have at least limited access.

Only eight respondents (10%) report that there is a limit to the number of managed prospects assigned to the library. That number ranges from 100 to 300. One respondent commented, "I don't know

if there's a limit, honestly. I'd love to have the opportunity to bump up against it and find out."

Library Development Program Staffing

The survey responses indicate that a majority of the programs are one-person professional shops. When asked how many professional staff raise money for the library, 42 respondents (53%) indicated that there is only one person—not including the library director—who is charged with this task. Twenty-two programs (28%) are staffed by two professional fundraisers, but only 16 have three or more professional staff, including one outlier with 43 full-time professionals. The reported FTE counts indicate that library fundraising is a full-time responsibility for 60% of professionals in one-person operations, but the percentage drops in the two- to six-person operations. Overall, only 49% of the reported professionals are full-time library fundraisers, excluding the outlier institution.

Library fundraising professionals carry a variety of job titles; more than twenty were reported. Regardless of their title, the individuals who were identified as the Chief Library Development Officer (LDO) most often report to the library director (34 responses or 43%), particularly in programs with two or more professional staff. Thirty-six percent report jointly to the library director and someone in the university development office, particularly in the one-person programs. Twenty-one percent report only to someone outside of the library. In most of the programs that have more than one professional position, the other positions report to the chief LDO.

Reported salaries range widely, from \$12,500 for a development assistant who devotes 25% of his/her time to fundraising to \$125,000 for a full-time chief LDO. While chief LDO salaries range from a minimum of \$14,732 (.20 FTE) to the maximum of \$125,000 (1 FTE), 61% cluster between \$50,000 and \$80,000. In all but a few cases, salaries are under \$65,000 for the second position, under \$56,000 for the third position, and \$45,000 or under for the fourth.

The majority of chief LDO salaries (53%) have joint funding sources. In almost all of these cases (92%), central development or the institution's foundation is the library's cost share partner, with each paying approximately half the salary. Somewhat surprisingly, only about half of the jointly funded positions report jointly to the funding partners. At institutions where there is a second library fundraising professional or more, the library budget covers the salary of 56% of the positions. Other sources include endowments, gifts, and state funds.

Although only 14 of 76 chief LDOs (18%) have a library science degree, the rest have other advanced degrees ranging from Masters (22) to MBAs (5) to PhDs (2) to JDs (2). Only ten other fundraising professionals are reported to have an MLS or MLIS degree; most have at least a bachelor's and 12 have various other advanced degrees.

Survey respondents were asked how fundraising staff divide their time among a variety of activities. Not unexpectedly, responses show that, on average, the chief LDOs spend more than one-third of their time on major gifts (35.4%). This is followed by donor relations (18.1%), special events (14.7%), Friends/board management (12.3%), staff and office management (11.8%), and annual giving (11.3%). Additional staff follow a similar pattern, though as the number of staff increases, so does the specialization of each staff member.

To assist them in their endeavors, almost one-half of the chief LDOs have at least one full-time administrative support staff member who reports directly to them. Almost an equal number have at least access to administrative support staff who are supervised by someone else. Twenty-nine percent have part-time support staff, and 30% have student employees. In addition, a few respondents have the help of graphic designers, writers and other publications staff, marketing and communications staff, and grants managers.

Library Development Officer

The majority of library development programs have had three or more chief LDOs since their inception (46 or 58%). Twelve have had five or more. This, however, does not imply frequent turnover. With only a few exceptions, the programs that have had two or more LDOs began before 2000. Twenty programs have had only one library development officer in their history and nine of these are among the oldest. Tenure in their current position as chief LDO ranges from three months to 18 years. The average tenure was surprising: a mean of 4.3 years and a median of 3 years. The career tenure in any library development program for these individuals is even longer, ranging from three months to 28 years. The mean tenure balloons to 5.5 years (with a median of 3 years), indicating that chief LDOs are career-professionals.

Prior to assuming their current LDO responsibilities, 26 (33%) were employed in another non-library fundraising position within the same institution. Sixteen (21%) were employed in a fundraising position not in higher education or libraries. Surprisingly, only four (5%) came from a different library development program, the same number that came from a different position within their institution's library development program. Sixteen respondents came to their current position from such diverse backgrounds as museums, social work, law, business, and campaign management.

Fewer than half of the chief LDOs (34 or 44%) are a member of the library director's executive cabinet, but even those who are not may meet with the director regularly or report to the group at least occasionally. Sixty percent of the LDOs are members of a department heads' committee or roundtable. One of those who isn't pointed out that she could be, but "is out seeing potential donors" rather than attending meetings.

Library Director's Role in Development

The survey asked several questions about the library director's role in fundraising activities. From the responses it is apparent that all directors are involved to a certain extent. Only 23 respondents (29%) report that the director is required to spend time on fundraising. At these institutions the director's involvement ranges from a minimum of 5% of their time to a maximum of 100% for three directors. The mean amount of time is 41% and the median is 25%. Of the 55 who reported that there is no specific time requirement, the range is 5% to 85%, with a mean of 26.5% and a median of 22.5%.

The survey asked whether there was a dollar threshold that had to be reached before the director became involved. The vast majority of directors participate in prospect meetings, calls to prospects, strategy sessions, proposal presentations, and closing gifts without a specific minimum dollar amount expected. Additionally, in three-quarters of the reporting institutions the director will—although mostly on an occasional basis—even participate in fundraising calls without the chief LDO being present.

Where there is a threshold, \$5,000 is the minimum and \$25,000 the median amount expected before the director becomes involved in phone calls, strategy sessions, prospect meetings, or closing a gift; the median is \$50,000 for presenting a proposal. Directors will sign letters of correspondence for almost any expected return.

Library Development Staff Evaluation

As can be expected, development staff are evaluated on a wide variety of criteria. The criteria used most frequently for chief LDOs are number of visits, dollars raised, number of asks/proposals, and overall dollar goal. These criteria are bunched fairly closely together with several others, such as visits per month, pipeline reports, number of gift closures, and number of moves, following closely behind. The pattern is similar for other development professionals. The situation is somewhat different for library directors; their two top criteria are

dollars raised and overall dollar goal. These two are used far more often than all the other criteria.

When asked to rank the importance of the evaluation measures, the respondents chose dollars raised as the most important measure for the chief LDO (49%), library director (54%), and other staff (38%). All other criteria trailed far behind for all three staff categories.

At the top of the second tier of important measure for LDOs are the number of visits and the number of asks/proposals. The number of asks/proposals ties with the number of gift closures as the top of the third tier. For directors, the overall dollar goal is clearly the second most important evaluation measure, followed by number of gift closures as third. Measures for other staff are more evenly distributed across the choices.

At about half of the responding institutions, the evaluation of the chief LDO is conducted by a combination of the library director and the institution's development department director. At a little more than a quarter, the library director is the sole evaluator. Other library development staff most often are evaluated by the LDO (33 responses or 65%).

Library Coordination with the Institution's Development Office

As academic enterprises continue to seek private funds with more frequency for more restricted purposes and/or specific units of institutions, coordination among competing priorities has become paramount. Subsequently, identifying the library's placement within this coordinated structure was a key component of this survey.

Above, it was reported that libraries have limited access to certain types of prospective donors (who may be "claimed.") Perhaps as a result, barely half of the survey respondents (41 or 53%) answered "Yes" to the question, "Is the library considered equal to other units/schools within the institution in terms of fundraising opportunities?" Respondents' comments reflect the on-going assertion of many library development programs that the libraries have no alumni and often struggle to

identify prospects even though they are an integral component of academic culture. The comment of one respondent about prospect pools sums up this issue quite succinctly, "Each college 'owns' its graduates and no other unit is allowed to solicit them. Hence, the library has little access to most of our 250,000 alums. We have to find people who like libraries, who may not have any relationship to the institution, who will give to the libraries."

Eighty-eight percent of the respondents report that the chief LDO is assigned as staff manager/relationship coordinator for individuals who have an interest in the library and almost all (96%) that the chief LDO is invited to participate in interdivisional strategy meetings about major prospects at least occasionally. Almost three-quarters (56 or 74%) report that the library director also participates occasionally or always in interdivisional strategy meetings about key prospects. By participating in such meetings, it is possible (and probable) that the library development officer and/or library director can advocate for library projects and inclusion in comprehensive proposals for major donors.

In annual giving activities such as direct mail, phonathons, and online solicitations, the library is presented as a giving option from the comprehensive institution perspective a majority of the time. Fifty-three percent of respondents report that the library is included as a possible gift designation at least occasionally in general institution direct mail appeals. Unfortunately, this means that libraries at 47% of the responding institutions are never included in the general direct mail appeals. The picture is much rosier on the online front. The library is included on the general institution giving Web site as a possible gift designee at 90% of the responding institutions. (Surprisingly, four institutions do not provide online giving opportunities.) Likewise, at all but six institutions the library is a possible gift designee during phonathon solicitations, if not always, then at least once in a while. Several institutions commented that the library is the recipient of second asks or as an alternative for other priorities.

Library development programs rely heavily on central development operations for staff resources for most fundraising activities. For example, on average, central development contributes 90% of the staff for phonathons, 78% for deferred/planned giving, 77% for records processing, 72% for gift processing, and 71 % for prospect research. Library development programs also rely on central development staff—although in a more reduced fashion—for corporate and foundation relations (63%), annual giving (60%), and information technology (56%). Library development programs contribute more of their own staff resources, on average, for development communications (66%) and special events (78%). The distribution of budgeted expenses for fundraising activities follows a similar pattern, though libraries contribute slightly more to the costs of direct mail and phonathons.

Conclusion

This survey grew out of numerous requests for information about benchmarking and the establishment of new library development programs that had been posed by, and to, members of ALADN (Academic Library Advancement and Development Network) and DORAL (Development Officers of Research and Academic Libraries) and was designed to establish an illustration of a "typical" library development program at an ARL member library. While it is apparent from the survey results that there is no cookie cutter model for such a program, some generalizations can be drawn which provide a baseline for further review of such programs.

An ARL library most likely has at least one library development professional charged with raising money exclusively for the library. This person has at least part-time staff support. This professional is likely the third development officer for the library in a program that has existed for 12 or more years and has been in their current position for approximately four years and makes about \$72,000.

These library development officers have at least limited access to institutional donors and are cre-

ative in their efforts to find new potential prospects. These programs are provided institutional support for activities such as records management and planned giving, but not as often for special events or development communications. Libraries have visibility in most institutional annual giving efforts, including direct mail, phonathon, and online giving, which allows many library development professionals (whose actual titles range from senior development manager to associate university librarian for philanthropy to director of advancement) to concentrate on major gifts. This library development professional may or may not participate in the executive cabinet of the library director.

Many library directors will participate in the fundraising for their library, but the amount of their time on associated tasks varies widely. The library director will participate in the evaluation of the development officer which will likely include factors such as the dollars raised, the dollar goal, the number of gift closures, the number of visits conducted, and the number of proposals delivered.

Library development programs have certainly grown and changed drastically since first discussed in SPEC Kit 6, though libraries continue to struggle to find needed prospects within large academic enterprises. Consequently, library development programs will continue to evolve as the need for, and limitations upon, funding continue.