UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO BOULDER

ACADEMIC REVIEW AND PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FINAL REPORT FOR
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Presented to Provost Russell Moore

February 4, 2015

Accepted: _____ 02.12.2015

Provost & Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs : Date

I. REVIEW PROCESS

The review of the University Libraries was conducted in accordance with the 2014 review guidelines. The unit prepared a self-study, which was reviewed by an internal review committee (IRC) of two faculty members from outside of the University Libraries and by an external review committee (ERC) consisting of two library administrative faculty from other institutions who visited the unit in March 2014. Each committee reviewed the self-study and other relevant documents and met with University Libraries faculty, staff, student employees, and university administrators, including the BFA Library Committee. The findings of the IRC and ERC are discussed in subsequent sections of this document, as appropriate.

This public document reflects the assessment of and recommendations for University Libraries as approved by the members of the Academic Review and Planning Advisory Committee (ARPAC).

II. OVERVIEW OF THE UNIT: INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS AND RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE WORK

The campus's standardized description of the unit may be found on the website of the Office of Planning, Budget and Analysis (PBA) (http://www.colorado.edu/pba/depts/arp/index.html). PBA updates the unit profiles annually in the fall semester. The PBA data in this report are from the University Libraries profile posted October 15, 2013, and reflect the state of the unit as of AY 2012-2013.

Personnel and Governance

PBA data indicate 35 tenured and tenure-track (TTT) faculty members (three full, 12 associate and 20 assistant professors; two faculty members serve as associate deans), three senior instructors, and five lecturers and adjunct instructors. Faculty members are responsible for student instruction, reference and research assistance, selection and organization of materials, management services, and administration of operations and facilities. According to the self-study, 17 university staff and 100 classified staff provide patron, technical, and other services, and 46 full-time student employees provide additional support. The PBA reports 10 university staff, 105 classified staff, and 265 student hourly employees.

The composition of the University Libraries faculty mirrors the national levels in librarianship, with 29 of the 46 positions held by females (63%) and 17 positions held by males. Approximately 21% of library faculty are underrepresented minorities. The staff have a similar composition; 65% female, 35% male, and 17% underrepresented minorities. Despite these statistics, the University Libraries management is predominantly male (nine positions, six held by males and three held by females).

A new organizational structure instituted in 2012 consists of an executive committee, a management team, and several cross-departmental working groups. The executive committee (the dean and two associate deans) is responsible for fiscal affairs, including salary decisions, personnel matters, and situations requiring an immediate decision or response. Library policies, strategic planning, operational decisions, and priorities are the responsibility of the management team, comprised of the executive committee and eight department directors. This group also advises the executive committee on personnel matters, recruitment plans, and budget requests and serves as the coordinating body to the cross-departmental working groups. The eight departments are defined by functions, subject specialization, and/or materials types.

The University Libraries consists of the main library (Norlin) and four branch libraries (William M. White Business Library; Howard B. Waltz Music Library; Gemmill Library of Engineering, Mathematics, and Physics; and Jerry Crail Earth Sciences and Map Library). Additional materials are stored at two offsite facilities, including almost two million volumes at the Preservation and Access Service Center for Colorado Academic Libraries (PASCAL).

Research and Scholarship

CU librarians have tenure-line faculty status because they participate in the academic processes of research, teaching, and service. Tenure at CU empowers the librarians to be engaged in the scholarship of how libraries function in a fast-changing world, allows research leave, and protects librarians' academic freedom. According to the IRC report, "The tenure process allows the librarians to do the research needed to build a 21st century learning environment." The self-study quotes a joint statement from the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) that clearly summarizes the importance of faculty status for librarians:

> College and university librarians share the professional concerns of faulty members. Academic freedom is indispensable to librarians in their roles as teachers and researchers. Critically, they are trustees of knowledge with the responsibility of ensuring the intellectual freedom of the academic community through the availability of information and ideas, no matter how controversial, so that teachers may freely teach and students may freely learn.

The University Libraries' tenure track reflects the university's professional standards, with an evaluation ratio of 40-40-20 for teaching (with librarianship in place of teaching), research, and service. Library faculty hold twelve-month appointments rather than the nine-month appointment typical of other faculty. The practice of librarianship is multifaceted. As specialists, they provide access to information and are involved in the development of resources, collections, and information systems, among many other

activities. Because the practice takes place in different settings, it may or may not involve classroom instruction, public contact, or management. Tenure-track faculty members are expected to contribute to the body of knowledge in their area(s) of expertise and build a record of scholarship with one or more coherent foci. As a whole, the scholarly output of University Libraries faculty is impressive, annually publishing 3.5 refereed articles and chapters and delivering 13.5 conference presentations and papers per individual over the last seven years. This speaks to the national visibility and impact of the library faculty.

Undergraduate and Graduate Program Contributions

While the University Libraries has no undergraduate or graduate programs, a number of important services are provided to the student population. Four instructional courses are offered at lower- and upper-division levels on research strategies and methods in library research. University Libraries conducts department- and topic-specific workshops and offers curricula-integrated instruction, research consultations, access to research materials, and group and individual study spaces for students. Graduate students noted in the self-study survey that online databases and physical materials, in particular, are "absolutely necessary" for their academic success. The ARPAC concludes that library services and collections are critical to the success and retention of students at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

Space and Infrastructure

Several renovation projects have improved the functionality of the library space. The Norlin Renaissance Plan resulted in a number of facility improvements, including a new west entrance, creation of a learning commons, relocation and upgrading of the physical environment for reference materials, a new dean's suite that includes the administrative offices, increased study space for students, and several small improvements and repairs throughout the building. Several services were consolidated within the facility. The William M. White Business Library was built since the last review. In 2010, several related services were consolidated through the merger of the Oliver C. Lester Library of Mathematics & Physics and the Leonard H. Gemmill Engineering Library to create the Gemmill Library of Engineering, Mathematics, and Physics.

Budget

According to the self-study, the primary funding source for the University Libraries budget is the university. FY12 expenditures were approximately $22 million, just under 3% of CU Boulder's FY12 expenditures on research, instruction, and public service. The self-study uses the University Libraries AAU ranking of 9th out 13 peer institutions to stress the point that "the last time the Libraries saw an increase in the operations budget, we were using a card catalog and typewriters." Approximately half of the annual budget ($10.4 million in FY14) goes towards materials. Database and journal

subscriptions make up 79% of the current annual materials budget, up from 71% in FY07. Increases in subscription costs have driven libraries to cancel subscriptions by 5-10% twice in the past eight years, and cuts in FY14 may be on the order of 8%. Efforts are made to build the general collections as cost-effectively as possible by leveraging relationships with other CU campuses, the Greater Western Library Alliance, and other consortia.

III. HISTORY OF PROGRAM REVIEW

University Libraries last underwent program review in 2000 under the since-retired Program Review Panel (PRP) process. In recognition of the numerous and serious issues and concerns confronting the University Libraries at the time, an additional group, the Blue Ribbon Panel was convened by the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs to summarize concerns and make recommendations. At the time of the PRP review, Libraries staff consisted of 55 librarians who held faculty status: 22 instructor lines and 23 TTT lines (12 of which were tenured); 10 lines were vacant. An additional 118 classified staff members also provided services. The composition of the library faculty mirrored the fact that, traditionally, members of the profession have been predominately female: 32 of the faculty lines were held by women, 13 by men. Approximately 15% of the faculty were members of underrepresented minority groups.

The PRP recommendations focused on:

(1) A need for positive, action-oriented budget strategizing. The provost was asked to set the library budget as a campus priority, but barring that, the university would need to redefine its level of library service to something significantly lower than current levels.

(2) A reestablishment of trust and improved communication with the provost through an advisory committee which would report to him, and movement of the dean of libraries position to the Office of the Provost.

(3) A thorough review of the librarian tenure system leading to establishment of promotion and tenure criteria appropriate to librarianship.

(4) Prioritization of critical services and definition of user needs that may go unmet if additional funding for staff is not identified by the provost. University Libraries was encouraged to seek external grants to supplement management of collections and preservation and digitization initiatives.

(5) Pursuit of funding for a major renovation of the Norlin Library.

The 2014 ERC observed a lack of progress on many of these recommendations.

IV. UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES IN A CAMPUS CONTEXT

The University Libraries plays a central role in supporting the research and teaching missions of the university. It enriches and advances "learning and discovery in the University, community, state and nation" (Libraries mission statement; Self Study) by providing access to resources for education, research, scholarship, and creative work. The strengths of University Libraries include the size, range, and specialization of its collections, its resourcefulness and ability to adapt to changing conditions when new funds are not forthcoming, and its responsiveness to initiatives reflecting emerging needs of the CU research environment. Current and future university initiatives, including the new College of Media, Communication, and Information (CMCI) and the School of Environment and Sustainability, will require substantial involvement from the University Libraries to develop and grow research and teaching resources.

V. ANALYSIS

Budget

The budgetary situation has been a long-lived and constant pressure on operations, morale, and sustainability of services for the libraries. A quote from one of the IRC interviewees sums up the primary, untenable situation: "we balance the budget on the back of people we don't hire." Moreover, materials acquisition cannot be cut any further without impacting the research mission of the university and its ability to recruit excellent faculty. The IRC has described the situation as at a "crisis point," threatening the University Libraries' ability to acquire new materials and staff the positions needed to fulfill traditional roles, not to mention meeting the demands of the changing environment for the creation, acquisition, and dissemination of knowledge. The IRC noted that the growing gap between the budget of the University Libraries and library budgets at peer institutions suggests that the term "peer institutions" is actually a misnomer. To return to the 2000 review, if supporting funds do not increase, the role and services provided by Libraries will need to be redefined at a significantly lower level.

The University Libraries budget is based almost entirely on university funds. The current budget is not keeping pace with costs. Grant support, such as from the NSF Infrastructure program, contributes to the unit budget, but considering the growth in digital technologies and a growing interest by funding agencies, additional efforts to pursue such funds could be successful. ARPAC suggests that new avenues of budget support be considered by the campus, including the following: (1) a direct share from campus ICR to the University Libraries; (2) a program/instructional fee, similar to the ACCESS fee; and (3) funds linked to improvement in student persistence.

Fundraising as a valuable complement to university funds appears to be underutilized by University Libraries. The ERC noted the following: "Without this private investment, the

CU library has become overly dependent upon salary savings." Once-successful external funding efforts need to be revived and increased. Renovation projects, technology, and staffing could all have a fundraising component. ARL libraries, including those at most public universities, have ambitious campaigns and are exceeding their targets. University Libraries is unique among units across the campus in that it has no pool of alumni from which to draw support. However, given the important link to CU that libraries provides for many alumni, there are opportunities for donors to benefit all students. In particular, special collections and preservation, such as the American Music Research Center and the Glenn Miller Archives, could be significant draws for donor support. Furthermore, the dean would be a valuable asset in working with potential donors and cultivating fundraising opportunities.

Structure and Governance

The 2012 implementation of a new organizational structure was the first major, comprehensive reorganization in many years. The incentive to change was articulated in one of the primary goals of the 2010-1013 Strategic Plan – to create a structure that enabled greater collegiality and promoted communication, leadership, creativity and innovation. Also, the reorganization was intended to address technological advances, severe economic challenges, and the loss of three faculty lines in AY2008/09.

Examples of successes associated with the new structure are numerous and include enhanced working relationships and a shared mission for some departments, a more consistent suite of services and expectations at service points, and pooling of expertise in areas such as instruction or scholarly communication. However, changes have been disruptive and notable frustrations have arisen from a continued need to improve communication, the desire for greater participation in decision-making, the burden of additional responsibilities, and declining morale that affects services. An internal survey by the self-study team found that 56% of the 23 responding faculty and staff indicated the restructuring had a "negative impact" on collections and services and 54% (largely staff respondents) did not feel the University Libraries leadership always considered the good of the whole organization in its decisions. More detailed questions about respondents' work were more positive. An external survey of 141 students, faculty, and university staff indicated that a there was a "positive impact" (~50%); the other option was "no impact".

Efforts are being made to reduce frustrations and improve internal communication through numerous approaches, including open forums to discuss issues of authority and decision-making; having the management team meet regularly with working groups to discuss specific projects; and hosting stress management and professional development workshops. ARPAC supports the recent implementation of a new organization structure and applauds the University Libraries' move towards increasing the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty. However, in this process, efforts must continue to improve

communication across the unit, with a concerted effort to clarify the differentiated roles held by faculty and staff.

Faculty and Staffing

The fact that University Libraries needs additional positions has been repeated through all reports, past and present. To stress the poor state of staffing levels, the self-study team quoted the FY12 ARL ranking of University Libraries as 67th (an improvement from FY11 rank of 71) and 13th of 15 AAU peers (public institutions with no medical school) in the ratio of librarians to students. While this is good information, peer comparisons are not the appropriate argument for additional positions and are only part of a bigger story. The ERC recommends that the University Libraries link its requests for new positions to the university's strategic initiatives. For example, subject and technology specialists will be required to support CU's growing emphasis in STEM education and technologies; and the new College of Media, Communication, and Information and the proposed School of Environment and Sustainability will need additional library support.

ARPAC concludes that the University Libraries need a stronger, more grounded argument for why they need more staff. Where does the unit want to excel? What research contributes to the unit's mission and what position do they want to reach to increase funding opportunities? As stated by the ERC, the University Libraries would benefit by being more connected with university strategic initiatives. For example, CMCI and the School of Environment and Sustainability will have need for library services and resources to develop undergraduate and graduate programs. ARPAC suggests the unit look to its inner strengths and plan strategically to develop its staff.

The self-study recommends that the University Libraries develop a more formalized mentoring program. Faculty mentoring currently operates by means of open discussion sessions, vita clinics, an optional 2-year review, and preparatory sessions prior to comprehensive and tenure reviews. Individual mentoring must be initiated by the "protégé." However, tenure-track faculty members, in response to program review questions, expressed frustration with the process and some were not aware that University Libraries offered mentoring; others felt the mentoring was ad-hoc. Timing of mentoring and feedback was considered ineffective. Tenure-track faculty members felt that more attention to the matching of mentors to junior faculty members is required, along with training of mentors and better communication on the part of the tenure committee.

ARPAC notes an unusually high percentage of faculty members at the assistant and associate professor ranks and suggests University Libraries examine the reason for this imbalance. This could be addressed through more formalized mentoring of assistant professors through the tenure process and associate professors' progression to full. Assistance may be required from outside the University Libraries.

Space

The ERC noted that, despite the challenges of the Norlin Library, the Renaissance Plan has resulted in a number of facility improvements, including the creation of a learning commons that improves access to technology and collaborative work/study spaces for students. ARPAC suggests that the library also consider resources available from the Capital Asset Management Plan for future facilities improvements. Beyond facility needs in Norlin itself, there is also the question of serving the needs of expanding programs on the east campus.

While, renovations to Norlin Special Collections space in recent years have improved conditions, "relocation to a collection storage area specifically designed for rare and fragile research materials is first among any recommendations" (2013 University Libraries Self-Study Report). The 2012 reorganization consolidated separately curated collections (Archives, Special Collections, American Music Research Center, and the Glenn Miller Archives) from three separate locations into Norlin. However, the storage environments are woefully inadequate due to poor climate control, unsealed ceilings leading to accumulation of dust and grit, inadequate shelving, and poor accommodation of some special materials (e.g. cold temperature storage). The creation of a Special Collections and Archives building ("The Cube") has been promoted not only to ensure the longevity of the materials but also to help showcase collections (a valuable asset for research, teaching, public relations, and fundraising) and free up much needed space in Norlin for classrooms, study areas, and on-site storage. ARPAC recognizes this critical need for improved archived facilities. However, given the current budget situation, the committee is not convinced that the Cube is the best avenue. Collaborations should be explored with other units, including the CU Art Museum and the Museum of Natural History, to leverage common interests. For example, economies of scale can make accessible the expensive climate controls necessary for sensitive collections across several units.

Undergraduate and Graduate Program Contributions

The self-study team surveyed and held focus groups with students and faculty members to determine the impact of the University Libraries' instruction programs. Undergraduate and graduate students were asked to respond regarding the importance of library collections and services to their academic success. University faculty members were asked about the University Libraries' influence on academic success, recruitment, and retention. Student results were markedly positive across the board, noting the "very important" to "absolutely necessary" nature of research service and study spaces, whereas workshops were considered "somewhat important." Faculty "strongly" or "somewhat agreed" that the University Libraries is an effective partner in ensuring undergraduate and graduate student success, recruitment, and persistence. Some

faculty members expressed appreciation for workshops and integration into their courses but stressed that University Libraries ought to build greater awareness about these services.

The self-study recommends that the University Libraries increase efforts to publicize its instructional services and building its capacity to provide course-integrated instruction for teaching research skills and strategies for students. ARPAC agrees. Particularly, greater involvement in the campus's first-year experience program and other retention activities, along with the addition of marketing and teaching positions, would help meet these goals. Assessments of the University Libraries' success in meeting these goals will require the development of appropriate metrics.

Diversity

The University Libraries seems not only very committed to recognizing the value and importance of a diverse faculty and staff but also has identified areas where it can make a difference. There has been notable progress since 2000 with respect to underrepresented minorities in the TTT faculty (from 15% to 21%). Recently, a diversity task force was formed and tasked with (i) identifying mechanisms by which diversity can be brought into higher profile in the libraries workplace, including hiring, retention, and other efforts, (ii) designing structural changes, including an analysis of the existing diversity committee, to promote the core values of diversity in an ongoing fashion and assist in the implementation of these structural changes, and (3) reviewing the University Libraries' diversity plan and recommending a strategy to update the plan. The task force is currently drafting a survey for faculty and staff to assess the "organizational climate of diversity."

The University Libraries has a faculty representative on the Boulder Faculty Assembly Diversity Committee and the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Community Engagement, and they have consulted with The Office of Disability Services regarding technology and access. The Provost's Fellowships for the Libraries program and the Friends of the Library Fellowship for undergraduates are advertised widely throughout the campus, including diverse student organizations, and have successfully attracted individuals from underrepresented populations. Moreover, the University Libraries has an obligation to provide access on all subjects that meet the needs, interests, and abilities of a diverse university community.

The University Libraries recognizes a need to have a systemic program that supports outreach activities and diversity training to provide better services and make a more diverse and inclusive workplace. The unit's intent is to structure diversity training with objectives and goals that prioritize diversity system-wide. The University Libraries aspires to develop partnerships with social justice missions on campus, including first-generation students, counseling and psychological services, transfer students, the

Women's Resource Center, and the Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer Resource Center.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

To the unit:

1. Develop a set of strategic initiatives for the University Libraries as a whole that faculty and staff embrace. As part of this effort, identify core strengths and areas where the unit wants to excel.
2. Strengthen requests for new faculty and staff by linking requests to university strategic initiatives. Specifically, the College of Media, Communication, and Information and the proposed School for Environment and Sustainability will require the expertise of University Libraries faculty for undergraduate and graduate instruction.
3. Continue to improve a formal mentoring program to ensure that all assistant and associate professors are guided through the tenure and promotion process. Examine the reasons for the imbalance of TTT ranks and address it with mentoring as appropriate. Assistance from outside the University Libraries may be required in this process.
4. Pursue new avenues of budget support in discussions with the provost. One option would be to propose a program/instructional fee similar to the ACCESS fee.
5. Develop a fundraising program that can contribute to goals related to staffing, archives, special collections, facilities, technology, and student support programs. Work with a dedicated development officer to outline an ambitious fundraising strategy.
6. Explore ways to boost the University Libraries' roles and expertise in information technology. Continue to build on the relationship with OIT.
7. Continue to explore better ways to communicate internally through forums, departmental meetings with the executive committee, and personnel-focused workshops. As part of this effort, make clear the differentiated roles held by faculty and staff in the University Libraries.
8. Continue to develop external communications to build relations between subject specialist librarians and the departments they serve.
9. Implement strategies to build university awareness of instructional programs and develop appropriate metrics to gauge their effectiveness in student persistence and success. Consider expanding use of online instructional modules.
10. Continue to implement plans to develop a systemic program that builds diversity awareness and partnerships within the University Libraries and the communities the unit serves. Continue training efforts to bring diversity "onto the radar" of University Libraries faculty and staff and advocate for faculty lines that help address diversity issues.

11. Develop collaborative strategies with other units, including the Museum of Natural History and the CU Art Museum, to advance plans for a new special collections storage facility.
12. Work to create an appropriate University Libraries presence on the east campus.

To Office of Information Technology:

13. Continue to work with University Libraries to improve access to information technology for the campus, either by ensuring that OIT staff are properly trained to address the particular requirements of the University Libraries or by supporting additional faculty and staff to serve these needs within the University Libraries.

To the provost:

14. Continue expansion of the library materials budget, but also invest in new staff support. In particular, in recognition of rapid changes in technology and higher education, support the addition of new positions in digital scholarship services.
15. Work with the University Libraries to pursue new avenues of budget support, particularly if the campus is going to follow a more performance-based budgeting model.
16. Support collaborative efforts by relevant units to define and move forward on a new storage facility.
17. Provide guidance to the University Libraries in addressing imbalances in rank of tenure-track faculty. Assist in developing a mentoring program that draws on faculty members from outside the University Libraries.

The dean of the University Libraries shall report annually on the first of April for a period of three years following the year of the receipt of this report (i.e., April 1st of 2016, 2017, and 2018) to the provost on the implementation of these recommendations. The provost, as part of the review reforms, has agreed to respond annually to all outstanding matters under her/his purview arising from this review year. All official responses will be posted online.