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Components of library’s development program 1

- A history of private support in excess of $500,000 per year
- A friends of the library organization
- Phone-a-thon on behalf of the library’s fundraising priorities
- Direct mail on behalf of the library’s fundraising priorities
- Printed giving materials
- Fundraising professional(s) assigned to raise money for the library
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LIBRARY DONOR GROUPS

Library access to donors (2018).
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### Library access to donors (Increases 2006-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Group</th>
<th>Access (Limited or Unrestricted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-donors (never givers) to other areas of the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other potential donor group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional employees outside of the library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University trustees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired employees of the institution (outside of the library)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/grandparents of current students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/grandparents of alumni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current fiscal year donors other areas of the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsed fiscal year donors other areas of the institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired library employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library employees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lapsed fiscal year donors to library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current fiscal year donors to library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT FOR LDO

Degrees completed: LDO (2018)

- BA/BS
- MLIS (or equivalent)
- JD
- EdD
- PhD
- Other degree
Position held by LDO before this position

- Another fundraising position in higher education, but not within a library: 60%
- Another fundraising position not in higher education or libraries: 40%
- Other position: 20%
- A fundraising professional position in a library development program: 10%
- A different fundraising position within this library: 5%
- A non-fundraising, but professional level position within a library: 5%
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ADMINISTRATIVE STATUS FOR LDO

LDO organizational level

- Same level as AUL
- Same level as department heads
- Other level
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CHANGE IN ACTIVITIES FOR LDO

2018 Median % of LDO time (Change from 2006)

- Other activity: 0%
- Staff and Office Management: -2%
- Friends/Board Management: -5%
- Corporation and Foundation Relations: 0%
- Special Events: -3%
- Major Gifts: 18%
- Donor Relations: -5%
- Annual Giving: 3%
Library Director’s Role in Development

Dir required to spend a specific amount of time on fundraising

- Yes: 20%
- No: 80%
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#ARLSPECKit359
THRESHOLD FOR LIBRARY DIRECTOR’S INVOLVEMENT

2018 Threshold for Dir Participation (Change from 2006)

- Other activity: 8%
- Initiate phone calls to donor prospects: 4%
- Prospect strategy sessions: 27%
- Prospect meetings: 43%
- Closing a gift: 24%
- Presenting proposal: 23%
- Sign letters of correspondence (including electronic communications): -4%
LIBRARY DIRECTOR SOLO FUNDRAISING CALLS

Dir participates in solo fundraising calls

Yes
No
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EVALUATION – DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

Important or Very Important Performance Measures for LDO's (Change from 2006)

- Visits per month (or other period): (18%)
- Pipeline reports: (-9%)
- Overall dollar goal: (19%)
- Other criteria: (7%)
- Number of visits: (4%)
- Number of qualified donors: (19%)
- Number of moves: (-9%)
- Number of gift closures: (26%)
- Number of asks/proposals: (13%)
- Moves per month (or other period): (16%)
- Joint proposals: (1%)
- Dollars raised: (8%)
- Assisting other units: (-3%)
EVALUATION AUTHORITY – DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS

Evaluation of the LDO

- Library director
- Managerial personnel from institution’s development unit
- Jointly

[Bar chart showing the evaluation distribution among library directors, managerial personnel from the institution’s development unit, and jointly.]
Important or Very Important Performance Measures for Dir's (Change from 2006)

- Visits per month (or other period): 15%
- Pipeline reports: 10%
- Overall dollar goal: -16%
- Other criteria: 8%
- Number of visits: 32%
- Number of qualified donors: 27%
- Number of moves: 9%
- Number of gift closures: 13%
- Number of asks/proposals: 13%
- Moves per month (or other period): 5%
- Joint proposals: -10%
- Dollars raised: -13%
- Assisting other units: 3%
LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT

Library Positioned Comparably to Other Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CAMPUS SUPPORT

Active engagement in fundraising for the library

- DO's from other colleges or units
- Deans or other college administrators
- University president
- Provost or chief academic officer
LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT – LDO

LDO Participates in Institutional-Level Meetings about Major Prospects

- Always: 20%
- Occasionally: 60%
- Never: 20%

#ARLSPECKit359
LIBRARY DEVELOPMENT SUPPORT - DIRECTOR

Dir Participates in Fundraising Strategy Meetings

- Always: 10%
- Occasionally: 60%
- Never: 30%

#ARLSPECKit359
Library Inclusion on Institution-Level Efforts

- Always: Phone-a-thon (30%), Direct Mail (30%)
- Occasionally: Phone-a-thon (60%), Direct Mail (40%)
- Never: Phone-a-thon (5%), Direct Mail (5%)
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## DEVELOPMENT FUNCTIONS and COST SHARING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Staffing</th>
<th>Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone-a-thon</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records processing</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect research</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift processing</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred/planned giving</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation/foundation relations</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct mail</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual giving</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development communications</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major gifts</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special events</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capital Campaign Goals and Realized

Campaign goal vs. Campaign total (final)
Who Set the Library’s Capital Campaign Goal?

- Met or exceeded campaign goal, N=8
  - University/Library: 6
  - Library: 1
  - University: 1

- Failed to meet or exceed campaign goal, N=5
  - University/Library: 2
  - Library: 2
  - University: 1
Do the library’s communications professionals or unit report through the library development office?

- Met or exceeded campaign goal, N=7
  - Yes: 3
  - No: 4

- Failed to meet or exceed campaign goal, N=5
  - Yes: 1
  - No: 4
Does the Library Have a Development Board?

Met or exceeded campaign goal, N=8

Failed to meet or exceed campaign goal, N=5

Yes

No
Average FTE Working 100% on Library Development

- Met or exceeded campaign goal, N=8
- Failed to meet or exceed campaign goal, N=5
Conclusion
Questions & Discussion

Join the conversation by typing questions in the chat box in the lower left corner of your screen
Thank you!
SPEC Survey Webcast on Library Development

1. Welcome (Lee Anne)

Hello, I am Lee Anne George, coordinator of the SPEC Survey Program at the Association of Research Libraries, and I would like to thank you for joining us for this SPEC Survey Webcast. Today we will hear about the results of the survey on Library Development. These results have been published in SPEC Kit 359, which is freely available at publications.arl.org.

Announcements (Lee Anne)

Before we begin there are a few announcements:
Everyone but the presenters has been muted to cut down on background noise. So, if you are part a group today, feel free to speak among yourselves.

We do want you to join the conversation by typing questions in the chat box in the lower left corner of your screen. I will read the questions aloud before the presenters answer them.

This webcast is being recorded and we will send registrants the slides and a link to the recording in the next week.

2. Introductions (Lee Anne)

Now let me introduce today’s presenters:

Brian W. Keith, is Associate Dean for Administrative Services and Faculty Affairs for the George A. Smathers Libraries at the University of Florida,
Joseph A. Salem, Jr., is University Librarian at Michigan State University Libraries, and
Kurt Cumiskey, is Associate Director of Development at Duke University Libraries

Use the hashtag ARLSPECKit359 to continue the conversation with them on Twitter.

Now, let me turn the presentation over to Brian.

3. Topics for Today (Brian)
Thank you, Lee Anne.

As an overview of our presentation, Joe, Kurt, and I are going to cover these topics.

Joe will begin with development activities and donor access, and cover the backgrounds of library development officers and their professional activities.

I will cover the involvement of library directors and university leadership, how personnel are evaluated, and how libraries and foundations coordinate efforts.

Kurt will cover capital campaign goals and outcomes, and communications and boards.

We have a lot to cover, so here is Joe.

4. Background [Joe]

Thanks Brian. As Brian indicated, I will be discussing development programs overall, access to donors overall, and the position of the chief library development officer. When it made the most sense, I have tried to offer comparisons to the 2006 SPEC survey to document the change over time. The components of the library's development program are a good example of noteworthy change over time and in some cases, a lack thereof.

The most noteworthy change over time was in “A history of private support in excess of $500,000 per year”, which increased 14% from 2006 to 2018. Another noteworthy (although less so) change was a decrease in the number of friends of the library organizations. The rest of the components were similarly distributed among respondents over time.

5. Library Donor Groups [Joe]

1. We also asked respondents to indicate the level of access to donor groups. The majority of respondents have unrestricted access to only four groups of donors, current fiscal year donors to the library, library donors who have lapsed for a year, current library employees, and library retirees.
2. The majority of respondents also enjoy limited or special project access to all other groups, including current students, current year and lapsed donors to other areas of the institution, parents and grandparents of current students and alumni, and university trustees.

The majority also enjoy unrestricted access to “other potential donor groups.” Respondents were asked to define these and there was great variation, but noteworthy examples include community borrowers, event attendees, foundations, and friends of the library.

6. Change in Access to Donor Groups [Joe]

This chart reflects changes in the combined limited/restricted and unrestricted access from 2006 to 2018.

1. It is worth noting that all combined access to all donor groups increased during this period.

2. Library employees; Retired library employees; Institutional employees outside of the library; Other potential donor group; Non-donors (never givers) to other areas of the institution; Lapsed fiscal year donors to other areas of the institution; and Retired employees of the institution (outside of the library), all went up 10–20 percent

3. Current fiscal year donors to other areas of the institution; Current students; Parents/grandparents of alumni; Parents/grandparents of current students; and University trustees, increased even more significantly between 2006 and 2018

7. Educational Attainment for LDO [Joe]

I will now shift my focus onto the chief library development officer. In addition to asking about the programs led by the chief library development officer, we sought data on the positions and those filling them. Of initial interest is the educational attainment of the development officer. The BA/BS degree was clearly the most common among development officers in 2018. The decline in the MLIS or equivalent is also noteworthy. In 2006, 19% of the development officers in the data held the MLS or equivalent, and by 2018, it was down to
10%. One may speculate that the training and background for these incumbents has been more focused on professional fundraising as a result.

8. Professional Background for LDO (Joe)

The professional preparedness for the chief library development officer is evident in their professional experience as well. We asked respondents to indicate the position held by the development officer just prior to their current one. The majority of responding institutions had development officers who held other fundraising positions in higher education, but not within the library, just prior to their current position. The next most common experience was a fundraising position, not within higher education or libraries. Very few were promoted from other positions in the library.

9. Administrative Status for LDO (Joe)

Finally, the reporting lines for the chief library development officer were sought. Although there was some variation, the most commonly reported was at the department head level. There was variation in the responses to “other level” but many of these were to units outside of the library, like central development. The AUL level may be somewhat underreported or confused in the data as well, because some responses to the “other level” included directly to the dean or director.

10. Change in Activities for LDO [Joe]

We also asked responding institutions to indicate the percentage of their time spent on various activities. As you can see from this chart, all activities reflect fairly even portions of the time commitments for the chief library development officer with the exception of major gifts, which represents the majority of their time. These activities are also stable between 2006 and 2018 again with the exception of major gifts, which has increased in time commitment by 18%.

I will now transition to Brian who will discuss the library director’s role in development.

11. Library Director’s Role in Development [Brian]
Thank you, Joe.
In our study, we were also interested in director’s activities.

Only 25% of institutions require the library director to spend a specific amount of time on fundraising activities, which is comparable to the findings in 2006. When there is a requirement, the average amount required is 50% of the director’s time.

Despite a limited number of institutions with requirements, library directors do actually spend a significant amount of time engaged in fundraising, on average 36% of their time, and a number of comments suggest that soft requirements or expectations do exist.

12. Threshold for Library Director’s Involvement (Brian)

Is there a point when library directors become involved?

We examined financial thresholds for a variety of fundraising activities and many institutions do require a specific gift or proposal level for director participation. 60 to 70% of respondents reported there was a minimum for director involvement in strategy sessions, prospect meetings, gift closings, and proposal presentations. And as the orange figures on the chart indicate, for all four of these development activities there is a pronounced increase in the frequency of required gift levels for director participation from the 2006 figures.

The dollar amount of these thresholds for director participation ranged widely from activity to activity. For example, for gift closings, the lowest level reported was $5,000 and the highest requirement reported was $250,000, with an average of about $79,000. The range of minimums for director phone calls to donors ranged from $500 to $250,000, with an average of about $77,000.

13. Library Director Solo Fundraising Calls (Brian)

We found that over 70% of library directors participate in fundraising calls without the chief LDO or other fundraising staff members, which is comparable to the figures from 2006. Based on the comments received, the solo interactions are often the result of a personal relationship with the donor and the solo interactions are not typically proposal deliveries but relationship building or sustaining in nature.

We also investigated the evaluation measures used for those involved in development. The results for development officers and other development personnel and directors all show the importance of metrics in evaluations.

For library development officers a variety of performance measures were deemed important or very important. The most common metrics were dollars raised; numbers of asks, closures, qualified donors, and visits; and overall goal.

As reflected in the orange figures, the importance of visit; of counts for qualified donors, closures, proposals, and moves; along with qualified donors all saw significant increases from 2006 to 2018.

15. Evaluation Authority—Development Officers [Brian]

In addition to evaluation measures, we also queried on evaluation authority—who actually performs the evaluations. This was of interest because we felt the relationship would reflect how development personnel are organizationally situated.

Most frequently, the evaluation of the library development officer is conducted jointly by the library director and a senior manager in university-level development—this was the case in 43% of responses.

16. Evaluation—Library Directors [Brian]

For library directors, an interesting variety of development performance measures were also reported as important or very important, which seems reasonable given the reported amount of time devoted to fundraising by these leaders. Dollars raised and overall dollar goal were the most common important or very important performance measures reported, in 2006 and 2018. However, both of these measures were reported with significantly less frequency in our study compared to 2006.

Counts for visits, qualified donors, proposals and closures were more commonly reported as important or very important performance metrics for library directors this year, compared to 2006.

17. Library Development Support [Brian]
We also wanted to learn how the library development program was supported in the larger organization.

So, are libraries positioned and supported comparably to other units in terms of fundraising opportunities? Unfortunately, nearly 60% of respondents indicated this was not the case. In the 2006 study, 53% of respondents had indicated their libraries were comparably situated, so this represents a 12% increase in these negative responses from 2006.

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 they are not comparably situated.

Comments from this survey’s respondents point out that 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.

18. Campus Support [Brian]

Fewer than half of the respondents reported active fundraising on behalf of the library by other campus administrators, like college deans, provosts, and presidents. While describing the importance of these supportive efforts in cultivation and recognizing donors, the submitted comments suggest this assistance is in fact infrequent and typically received only in response to a request of the library.

In contrast, 68% of respondents reported support from development personnel in other colleges or units, including the central fundraising units for the university. At the college level, the support often takes the form of joint proposals and seems to represent institutional cultures of collaboration. Examples of the centralized support include regional and international development personnel, and annual gift and planned giving programs.

19. Library Development Support—LDO [Brian]

The library development officer’s involvement at the campus level is another indicator of the library development program’s organizational circumstances.
Per our responses, 61% of library development officers are invited to participate in institutional-level meetings about major prospects, while roughly equal numbers are always or never invited.

20. Library Development Support—Director [Brian]

That library development officer engagement pattern we just saw closely matches the responses for how often the library director is invited to participate in institutional-level strategy meetings about fundraising. Very few library directors are always at the table and a comparable number are always excluded. Not surprisingly, the responses indicate that the occasional engagement of the director is on a case-by-case basis.


In regards to institutional fundraising activities, like phone-a-thons and direct mail solicitations, the library is most commonly an occasional explicit donor option. In 37% of responses, the library is always listed.

Additionally, 98% of respondents reported that the library is included on the institution-level giving website as a possible gift designation.

22. Development Functions and Cost Sharing [Brian]

Libraries engage in a wide range of fundraising activities in varying levels of partnership with the parent institution. Our study sought to determine how these activities are staffed and funded. We found, not surprisingly, many centralized systems, like IT, and centralized supports, like record keeping and research, are most significantly staffed and funded by the university.

Only in the cases of development communications, and major gift and special event activities are the staffing and funding more significantly supported by the libraries.

Now, I will hand it over to Kurt.

23. Capital Campaign Goals and Realized [Kurt]

More than two-thirds of the responding libraries indicated they are in a capital campaign or had recently finished one. While there are many factors that can determine whether an academic research library
succeeds or fails in raising money, from things outside their control (like the economy or tax laws) to things for which they should have more control (like donor base and organizational structure), we looked at how each of these libraries responded to several questions on the survey to try to determine if there were obvious factors that might predict success or failure.

The thirteen libraries that claimed they had recently completed a capital campaign are sorted here by how near they came to achieving their campaign goal, with a high of 200% over goal and a low of 76% under goal. Eight libraries met or exceeded their capital campaign goals, while five did not.

In short, within this group, the libraries that met or exceeded their capital campaign goals were more likely than the mean (1) to have determined their campaign goal either on their own or in consultation with the university (Central Development Office or Foundation), (2) to have the development office overseeing the communications operation, (3) to have a development board, and (4) to have FEWER staff devoted 100% to development work.

24. Who Set the Library’s Capital Campaign Goal? (Kurt)

Of the 44 libraries responding to the question, “How and by whom was the library capital campaign goal established,” 48% claimed the decision was made jointly between the university and libraries, 23% said the libraries alone decided, and 29% said the university alone decided.

The campaign goals of the eight libraries that met or exceeded their target were determined jointly between the university and library, and by the library alone, 63% and 25% of the time respectively. In only one case (12%) was the library’s goal determined by the university alone. For the five libraries that failed to meet or exceed their campaign goal, there’s a different story. The goal for none of them was decided jointly between the university and library. Forty percent of the time, the goal was determined by the library alone, and 60% of the time by the university alone.

Overall, the library’s campaign was determined 71% of the time by either the library alone or library jointly with the university. The eight libraries that had successful campaigns exceeded that mark (88%),
while the unsuccessful libraries fell far short (40%). There are many benefits of better coordination and communication with central development, including setting realistic campaign goals, sharing information about prospects, and coordinating solicitations.

25. Do the library's communications professionals or unit report through the library development office? (Kurt)

Of the 51 libraries that responded to the question, “Do the library's communications professionals or unit report through the library development office?” only 16% indicated communications fell under development, while 84% said it did not. Those libraries that met or exceeded their campaign goals were nearly three times more likely (43%) to have communications reporting to development, while those libraries that failed to meet or exceed their campaign goals were nearly identical (20%) to the overall mean.

26. Does the Library Have a Development Board? [Kurt]

Of the 60 participating libraries, 52% said they had a development board. Those libraries that met or exceeded their campaign goals were more likely (63%) to have a development board, while those that failed to meet or exceed their campaign goal were significantly less likely (20%) to have a development board.

27. Average FTE Working 100% on Library Development [Kurt]

The eight libraries that met or exceeded their campaign goals, at 1.375 FTE, had fewer staff than the mean of 1.48, while the five libraries that didn’t meet or exceed their campaign goals, at 2.6 FTE, had significantly more staff than the mean.

Of the eight libraries that met or exceeded their campaign goal, the chief library development officer is evaluated 88% of the time by the library director alone or jointly between the library director and a senior officer in central development. Only 12% of the time is the LDO evaluated only by someone in central development. Of those five libraries that failed to meet their campaign goal, none of the chief library development officers are evaluated jointly by the library director and central development. They are evaluated 40% of the time by the library director alone, and 60% of the time by central development alone.
28. Conclusion [Kurt]

We have seen some evidence of the further professionalization of development programs among responding institutions between 2006 and 2018. Chief Library Development Officers are decreasingly coming from within the library, increasingly have professional fundraising experience, spend more of their time engaged in major gifts and, although still relatively restricted, enjoy more access to donor groups in 2018 than they did in 2006.

A couple of other changes over the past 12 years: Sadly, we saw an increase in the percentage of institutions that feel they are not positioned comparably to other units. Perhaps this perception relates to the increase in the use of development outcome metrics in the evaluations of library directors and development officers. Happily, however, we saw an increase in access to donors and prospects across a variety of categories, and the majority of respondents reported active engagement by development officers from colleges and other units in library fundraising. Additionally, libraries are benefitting from significant central investment, in the form of personnel and cost coverage, for development systems, supports, and activities.

The libraries that met or exceeded their capital campaign goals were more likely than the mean to have determined their campaign goal either on their own or in coordination with the university's central development or foundation office, to have the development office overseeing the communications operation, to have a development board, and to have fewer staff devoted 100% to development work.

29. Questions & Discussion (Lee Anne George)

Thank you, Brian, Joe, and Kurt. And now we welcome your questions. Please join the conversation by typing questions in the chat box in the lower left corner of your screen. I will read the questions aloud before the presenters answer them.

30. Thank You! (Lee Anne George)

Thank you all for joining us today to discuss the results of the library development SPEC survey. You will receive the slides and a link to the recording in the next week.