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Overview

In early 2014 the University Library Council (ULC) completed an analysis that outlined the benefits and drawbacks of the current structure of the libraries and offered suggestions for future strategic directions. Their analysis and suggestions became the impetus for a review facilitated by an external reviewer but with deep expertise in the issues and trends in research libraries and higher education. Through a competitive process DJA Consulting was engaged to conduct a review that will result in: 1) development of a strategic direction for the Tufts libraries that will maximize their ability to support the university community and its teaching, research and service mission and 2) align with the aspirations outlined in Tufts T-10 Strategic Plan. This review is not part of Tufts TEAM initiative, nor is it an effort to find financial savings within the libraries or to eliminate library positions. This document, Libraries Organizational Review: Final Report and Recommendations, proposes options and recommendations for organizational and funding structures that will maximize the Tufts libraries’ ability to enact the University’s mission and vision and align with its priorities.

The review spans four libraries on three campuses (Ginn Library for The Fletcher School, the Hirsh Health Sciences Library for the Schools of Medicine, Dental Medicine, Friedman Nutrition Science and Policy and Sackler Graduate Biomedical Sciences, Tisch Library for the Schools of Arts & Sciences and Engineering, and Webster Family Library for the Cummings School of Veterinary Medicine); it includes Digital Collections and Archives (DCA) and considers University Library Technology Services (ULTS).

The review and recommendations focus on the future – aligning the organizational structure and funding with a vision of libraries for a research university in the digital age. The consultants assert that the Tufts’ libraries are not “broken”; the recommendations resulting from this review are not crafted with the aim to “fix” the libraries, although attention has been paid to minimizing some acknowledged challenges. The intent is to preserve and enhance existing strengths while positioning the libraries and the University to take advantage of opportunities, as both higher education and information management are changing.

This report is purposefully educational, rather than prescriptive, in order to enable discussion across the University about the future of the libraries. It describes four potential scenarios with illustrative organization charts. DJA Consulting recommendations are summarized along with some considerations for next steps. The ample appendices are meant to ensure that additional data, perspectives and areas for consideration that surfaced during the review are available for deeper analysis. In particular, we would like to call to your attention Appendix A. Campus Sentiment, a synopsis of comments gathered from campus stakeholders specifically about changes to the libraries organization and funding.
Process and Deliverables

The DJA consultants work was informed by an understanding of the University mission, vision, organization, culture and funding through input from over 40 members of the Tufts community.

DJA Consulting has now completed and submitted as deliverables:

1. In-depth benchmarking of the current status and future-oriented directions for a set of nine (9) peer and aspirant institutions;
2. A qualitative assessment of the University Libraries’ needs, strengths and weaknesses, with a forward-looking perspective; and
3. This written report summarizing recommendations and rationale for organizational and funding structures that will maximize the libraries’ ability to enact the University’s mission and vision and align with its priorities.
Scenarios

Why Use Scenarios?

Scenario analysis is a process of analyzing possible future events by considering alternative options and potential outcomes. In response to the charge given to DJA Consulting by the Provost to “create an educational document that our stakeholder community can use to make decisions about how to proceed,” four scenarios are presented along with supporting information and DJA Consulting’s carefully weighed ideas about the merits of each. The scenarios are based on information surfaced during the exploration of the current state, peer benchmarking and a qualitative analysis.

These scenarios present four different possibilities along a continuum for the University to pursue for the libraries, none of which is intended to be a final solution. Instead, the intention is to 1) present options that force serious consideration and clarification of the vision and 2) surface desirable elements that could be configured into the appropriate and customized framework for Tufts.

The main elements of each scenario are presented in chart from on the next page of this document, to allow easy, high-level comparison. The elements we identified as most important for decision makers to have at-a-glance are:

- General Description
- Organizational Structure
- Funding Model
- Peer Examples
- Value Proposition

Following the high-level overview is a more detailed explanation of each scenario. For each, we asked and attempted to answer this question: “What does this scenario uniquely enable Tufts faculty and students to do?” An additional question is “In what ways does this scenario uniquely enable an infrastructure that allows the Tufts libraries to meet the needs of a research university?” We also identified how engaged leadership for the libraries might be demonstrated in the specific scenario, any real or perceived challenges to be faced by pursuing a particular scenario, what change in Tufts’ current level of investment this scenario might require, and we speculated ramp-up time for initial implementation and overall time to realization of the scenario’s benefits. An organization chart accompanies each scenario.

Following these descriptions, DJA Consulting provides recommendations and rationale for organizational and funding structures outlined in each scenario that will maximize the Tufts libraries’ ability to enact the University’s mission and vision and align with its priorities.
### Scenario 1  
**SCHOOL-BASED LIBRARIES**
- Four independent school-based libraries; schools administer their libraries
- Digital Collections and Archives (DCA), an independent University-wide unit, administered by Provost’s Office
- University Library Technology Services (ULTS), a University-wide unit, administered by Tufts Technology Services (TTS)

### Scenario 2  
**MAIN LIBRARY + SPOKESPERSON**
- A University Librarian (UL) represents all libraries and is responsible for Tisch Library
- Provost’s Office, in partnership with A&S&E, administers Tisch as the Main/University Library
- Other school-based libraries and DCA remain independent and responsible for all user, collections, and administrative services (OR additional libraries can be administered by the UL, at the discretion of the school)
- Provost’s Office administers DCA
- TTS administers ULTS

### Scenario 3  
**USERS LOCAL, COLLECTIONS CENTRAL**
- A University Librarian (UL) represents all libraries, is responsible for Tisch Library and for university-wide collections services
- Provost’s Office, in partnership with A&S&E, administers Tisch as the Main/University Library
- Provost’s Office administers university-wide collections services, including DCA
- Other school-based libraries remain independent and responsible for all user and administrative services (OR additional libraries can be administered by the UL, at the discretion of the school)
- ULTS remains in TTS (or can become part of university-wide collections services, at the discretion of the VP/CIO)
- University Library implements library technology strategy development related to collections
- Service Level Agreements (or MOUs) ensure schools of continued quality collections and establish accountability

### Scenario 4  
**STRATEGIC INTEGRATION, LIBRARIES AS A COMMON GOOD**
- A University Librarian (UL) represents all libraries and is responsible for all user services, collections services, and administrative services
- Provost’s Office administers fully integrated University Libraries system
- School-based libraries remain in place physically and maintain strong relationships with schools administrative and academic programs but are integrated into library system organizationally
- DCA is fully integrated as part of the strategic research library
- ULTS is integrated as part of the strategic research library with strong relationship with TTS
- University Libraries implement broad-based library technology strategy development
- Service Level Agreements (or MOUs) ensure schools of continued quality collections and user services and establish accountability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Organizational Structure (top level and cross-library; see org charts)</th>
<th>Funding Model</th>
<th>Peer Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 subgroups!found!in!one!decentralized!library!| Four library directors report to respective Deans/EADS  
DCA reports to Associate Provost  
ULTS reports to TTS  
Collaboration across libraries is voluntary through University Library Council with rotating leadership and 15 subgroups | Schools fund all aspects of their libraries  
TTS funds ULTS  
Provost’s Office funds DCA from “tax” for University-wide services | None  
Case Western, Duke, Georgetown, Northwestern, Washington Univ |
| 15!subgroups!found!in!one!decentralized!library! | University Librarian reports to Associate Provost (dotted line or dual reporting to A&S&E/Deans/EADS possible)  
Other school library directors report to respective Deans/EADS or to UL, at the discretion of the school (dotted line or dual reporting possible)  
DCA reports to Provost’s Office or UL, at the discretion of the Provost  
ULTS reports to TTS  
University Librarian chairs ULC and meets regularly with other library directors to coordinate university-wide library initiatives; streamlines/improves ULC group processes | Schools fund all aspects of their libraries  
TTS funds ULTS  
Provost’s Office funds UL and DCA from “tax” for University-wide services | Harvard |
| 15!subgroups!found!in!one!decentralized!library! | University Librarian reports to the Provost (dotted line or dual reporting to A&S&E and other school Deans/EADS possible)  
Other school library directors report to respective Deans/EADS or to UL, at the discretion of the school (dotted line or dual reporting possible)  
All libraries’ collections staff and DCA become part of a new library organizational structure for collections reporting to UL  
ULTS reports to TTS or to UL, at the discretion of the VP/CIO (dotted line or dual reporting possible)  
University Librarian chairs ULC and meets regularly with other library directors and collections specialists to coordinate collections initiatives and expenditures; sunsets some ULC groups | Schools fund user and administrative staff and services of their libraries  
TTS funds ULTS (or shifts funding to Provost’s Office)  
Provost’s Office funds UL and all collections-related expenses (and DCA) from “tax” for University-wide services plus reallocation of current school-based collections budgets and collections staffing | Brandeis, Brown, Dartmouth, Cornell (all except med) |

| Value Proposition | Today’s users receive excellent services customized to their discipline at their “local” library and the libraries have solid relationships with their respective schools; Tufts libraries’ organization not similar to other peers | Tufts gains a library spokesperson in University leadership and external venues while local services and school relationships are maintained; Tufts libraries more consistent with peers with decentralized model | Tufts T-10 priorities are supported by the libraries with enhanced assistance for research practices and collections that serve growing interdisciplinarity needs across the entire university while local user-centered services are increasingly specialized; efficiencies and resource reallocation enable support for new needs in collections services; Tufts libraries apply hybrid model found in one decentralized library | Tufts libraries are a common good, achieving visionary leadership and a contemporary, innovative action agenda in alignment with T-10; high quality local services and spaces support research and teaching, resources are directed toward emerging developments in scholarly communication, and efficient central services enable support for new needs; Tufts libraries on par with peers with centralized model |

---

Prepared by DJA Consulting for Tufts University
### Scenario 1: School-Based Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Proposition</th>
<th>Today’s users receive excellent services customized to their discipline at their “local” library and the libraries have solid relationships with their respective schools; Tufts libraries’ organization not similar to other peers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **General Description** | • Four independent school-based libraries; schools administer their libraries  
• Digital Collections and Archives (DCA), an independent University-wide unit, administered by Provost’s Office  
• University Library Technology Services (ULTS), a University-wide unit, administered by Tufts Technology Services (TTS) |
| **Organizational Structure (top level and cross-library)** | See next page for organization chart |
| **Funding Model** | • Schools fund all aspects of their libraries  
• TTS funds ULTS  
• Provost’s Office funds DCA from “tax” for University-wide services |
| **Peer Examples** | • None |
| **Uniquely Enables for Tufts Faculty and Students** | • Excellent curricular services for students and faculty, customized to the disciplines, provided by Research & Instruction librarians and other local library staff |
| **Uniquely Enables Library Infrastructure for a Research University** | • Each library independent, therefore infrastructure is primarily school library-based, distributed  
• Strong relationships between the respective libraries, library staff, and the schools  
• Core University-wide services – digital collections, archival management and library information technology – acknowledged by creation and support of DCA and ULTS  
• ULC and subgroups establish some shared services relying heavily on voluntary participation and goodwill, and a culture of collaboration |
| **Engaged Leadership on campus and externally** | • Tisch has Faculty Library Committee (A&S&E faculty and student representatives)  
• School library directors/managers participate in school academic and administrative groups to varying degrees  
• Active in Boston Library Consortium but participants cannot represent all libraries  
• Tufts holds membership in many national library organizations |
| **Challenges** | • Missing participation in University-wide planning and leadership venues  
• Lacking a designated University-wide leader to guide decision-making and be accountable for the libraries overall  
• Inadequately developing and scaling programs that serve Tufts research agenda  
• Making insufficient progress in leveraging Tufts unique resources, intellectual assets  
• Maintaining an overly conservative approach to legacy (print) collections  
• Not fully matching library spaces to emerging needs  
• Failing to develop and integrate robust academic information management technologies into the libraries to support teaching, learning, and research activities  
• Over-relying on goodwill and voluntary participation in standing committees for shared decision-making across the libraries  
• Using some inefficient financial processes  
• Affected by different funding priorities and each school’s (varying) available resources |
| **Change in Investment** | • Status Quo |
| **Time to Realization** | • Status Quo |
SCENARIO 1: SCHOOL-BASED LIBRARIES

- Deans/EADS
- Associate Provost
- Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer
- School Libraries: Ginn (Fletcher)
  Hirsh HSL (Med, etc.)
  Tisch (A&S & Engin)
  Webster (Vet Med)
- Digital Collections & Archives
- University Library Technology Services

University Library Council (with rotating chair)
6 teams report to ULC
2 task forces have dotted line to ULC
7 teams report indirectly to ULC, through the Services Steering team
## Scenario 2: Main Library + Spokesperson

### Value Proposition

Tufts gains a library spokesperson in University leadership and external venues while local services and school relationships are maintained; Tufts libraries more consistent with peers with decentralized model

### General Description

- A University Librarian (UL) represents all libraries and is responsible for Tisch Library
- Provost’s Office, in partnership with A&S&E, administers Tisch as the Main/University Library
- Other school-based libraries and DCA remain independent and responsible for all user, collections, and administrative services (OR additional libraries can be administered by the UL, at the discretion of the school)
- Provost’s Office administers DCA
- TTS administers ULTS

### Organizational Structure (top level and cross-library)

- University Librarian reports to Associate Provost (dotted line or dual reporting to A&S&E Deans/EADs possible)
- Other school library directors report to respective Deans/EADS or to UL, at the discretion of the school (dotted line or dual reporting possible)
- DCA reports to Provost’s Office or UL, at the discretion of the Provost
- ULTS reports to TTS
- University Librarian chairs ULC and meets regularly with other library directors to coordinate university-wide library initiatives; streamlines/ improves ULC group processes

### Funding Model

- Schools fund all aspects of their libraries
- TTS funds ULTS
- Provost’s Office funds UL and DCA from “tax” for University-wide services

### Peer Examples

- Case Western, Duke, Georgetown, Northwestern, Washington University

### Uniquely Enables for Tufts Faculty and Students

- Maintains excellent curricular services for students and faculty
- No other significant change for users

### Uniquely Enables Library Infrastructure for a Research University

- A designated leader to represent Tufts’ libraries University-wide, on campus and externally
- Greater awareness of University-wide strategic initiatives
- Maintains strong relationships with the schools
- Leadership and guidance for strengthening collaborative decision-making in ULC
- Efficiency and effectiveness of ULC and subgroups improved

### Engaged Leadership on campus and externally

- Continues Tisch Faculty Library Committee (A&S&E faculty and student representatives)
- University Librarian joins Provost’s Council
- School library directors/managers participate in school academic and administrative groups to varying degrees
- University Librarian represents all of Tufts libraries in all organizations, except those exclusive to specific schools or functions

### Challenges

- Treats A&S&E differently than other schools and Tisch differently than other libraries
- Need to establish effective dotted line or dual reporting or other effective communication and accountability to school
- Addition of a UL without other significant value added may not be fully embraced by stakeholders
- Most current challenges unchanged

### Change in Investment

- Change job description for Tisch library director or add a University Librarian position (possibly reallocate an existing senior library position)
- Gain efficiencies from improving ULC group processes

### Time to Realization

- Ramp up time: Immediate
- Realization: 6 - 12 months
SCENARIO 2:
MAIN LIBRARY + SPOKESPERSON

- Deans/EADS
- Associate Provost
- University Librarian
- Vice President for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer
- Tisch Library
  - OPTIONAL:
  - *School libraries
  - Tisch dotted line or dual reporting to A&S&E
- Digital Collections & Archives
  - DCA reporting at discretion of the Provost's Office
- University Library Technology Services

*School libraries reporting at discretion of school administration

University Library Council (UL as permanent chair)
6 teams report to ULC
2 task forces have dotted line to ULC
7 teams report indirectly to ULC, through the Services Steering team
### Scenario 3: Users Local, Collections Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Proposition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tufts T-10 priorities are supported by the libraries with enhanced assistance for research practices and collections that serve growing interdisciplinary needs across the entire university while local user-centered services are increasingly specialized; efficiencies and resource reallocation enable support for new needs in collections services; Tufts libraries apply hybrid model found in one decentralized library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A University Librarian (UL) represents all libraries, is responsible for Tisch Library and for university-wide collections services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provost’s Office, in partnership with A&amp;S&amp;E, administers Tisch as the Main/University Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provost’s Office administers university-wide collections services, including DCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other school-based libraries remain independent and responsible for all user and administrative services (OR additional libraries can be administered by the UL, at the discretion of the school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Ginn Library currently uses a variation of this model, providing user and administrative services while Tisch handles collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ULTS remains in TTS (or can become part of university-wide collections services, at the discretion of the VP/CIO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University Library implements library technology strategy development related to collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service Level Agreements (or MOUs) ensure schools of continued quality collections and establish accountability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Structure (top level and cross-library)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• University Librarian reports to the Provost (dotted line or dual reporting to A&amp;S&amp;E and other school Deans/EADS possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other school library directors report to respective Deans/EADS or to UL, at the discretion of the school (dotted line or dual reporting possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All libraries’ collections staff and DCA become part of a new library organizational structure for collections reporting to UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ULTS reports to TTS or to UL, at the discretion of the VP/CIO (dotted line or dual reporting possible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University Librarian chairs ULC and meets regularly with other library directors and collections specialists to coordinate university-wide collections initiatives and expenditures; sunsets some ULC collections groups, potentially Data, Summon Implementation, Collections, Discovery Platforms, Metadata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| See next page for organization chart |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Schools fund user and administrative staff and services of their libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• TTS funds ULTS (or shifts funding to Provost’s Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provost’s Office funds UL and all collections-related expenses (and DCA) from “tax” for University-wide services plus reallocation of current school-based collections budgets and collections staffing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University increases fund-raising and development for collections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peer Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Harvard (Harvard Library “shared services”, implemented after long and careful review and analysis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uniquely Enables for Tufts Faculty and Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains excellent curricular services for students and faculty and other unique discipline-based user services are developed and provided by locally-based Research &amp; Instruction librarians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensures access to quality core collections important across the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Better enables cross-disciplinary research support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhances access to Tufts’ unique resources and intellectual assets (e.g., special collections, theses &amp; dissertations, archival material valuable to research)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Introduces support for digital scholarship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frees up valuable library space to use for emerging academic needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uniquely Enables Library Infrastructure for a Research University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A designated leader to represent Tufts’ libraries University-wide, on campus and externally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhances efforts to support University’s Strategic Plan and initiatives, while local user and administrative library services support school plans and initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maintains strong relationships with the schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frees up staff in school-based libraries to focus exclusively on unique discipline-based user services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develops integrated vision for collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Applies new solutions to legacy (print) collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Maximizes collections budgets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improves efficiencies in staffing collections-related functions and financial processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimizes over-reliance and extensive use of staff time on standing committees for shared decision-making related to collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provides opportunity to reallocate human resources to university-wide digital library and information management services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engaged Leadership on campus and externally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consider creating a University Library Steering Committee (representatives from Provost’s Office, school administrators and faculty) to advise the UL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Continues Tisch Faculty Library Committee (A&amp;S&amp;E faculty and student representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University Librarian joins Provost’s Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School library directors/managers participate in school academic and administrative groups to varying degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• University Librarian represents all of Tufts libraries in all organizations, except those exclusive to specific schools or functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tufts libraries established as willing and reliable partner externally for collaborative collections initiatives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Requires UL with effective leadership skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to establish effective dotted line or dual reporting or other effective communication with and accountability to schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need to establish effective communication with many stakeholders to ensure that collections match research and teaching needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Could be difficult to implement and administer transition to selective centralized budgeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Change in roles and responsibilities for collections staff requires leadership and support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many current challenges minimized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Investment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Add University Librarian position (possibly reallocate an existing senior library position)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reallocate a position for library technology strategy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gradually redesign positions related to collections; fewer staff in print-based resources and more in digital collections, e-resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gain efficiencies in human resources from streamlining ULC subgroups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time to Realization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ramp up time: 3 - 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Realization: 1 - 3 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCENARIO 3:
USERS LOCAL, COLLECTIONS CENTRAL

University Library Council (UL as permanent chair)
Data, Summon Implementation, Collections, Discovery Platforms,
Metadata and Electronic Resource Management teams report to UL
(team charges reviewed; sunset as needed)
5 teams report to ULC
4 teams report indirectly to ULC, through the Services Steering team

*School Libraries
*School libraries’ public and administrative services, reporting at discretion of school administration

Tisch dotted line or dual reporting to A&S&E

VP for Information Technology and CIO

ULTS reporting at discretion of VP/CIO
**Scenario 4: Strategic Integration, Libraries as a Common Good**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Proposition</th>
<th>Tufts libraries are a common good, achieving visionary leadership and a contemporary, innovative action agenda in alignment with T-10; high quality local services and spaces support research and teaching, resources are directed toward emerging developments in scholarly communication, and efficient central services enable support for new needs; Tufts libraries on par with peers with centralized model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### General Description

- A University Librarian (UL) represents all libraries and is responsible for all user services, collections services and administrative services
- Provost’s Office administers fully integrated University Libraries system
- School-based libraries remain in place physically and maintain strong relationships with schools administrative and academic programs but are integrated into library system organizationally
- DCA is fully integrated as part of the strategic research library
- ULTS is integrated as part of the strategic research library with strong relationship with TTS
- University Libraries implement broad-based library technology strategy development
- Service Level Agreements (or MOUs) ensure schools of continued quality collections and user services and establish accountability

### Organizational Structure (top level and cross-library)

- University Librarian reports to the Provost
- All libraries staff become part of integrated system that reports to the UL
- School library directors have a dotted-line report to respective Deans/EADS
- ULTS has a dotted line report to VP/CIO
- The integrated libraries form a more contemporary, streamlined organizational structure
- Library directors become part of University Librarian’s senior staff and participate in library-wide decision-making; sunsets ULC and uses standing and project committees as needed

### Funding Model

- Provost’s Office funds all aspects of University Libraries from “tax” for University-wide services plus reallocation of all current school-based library and TTS budgets and staffing
- University increases fund-raising and development for all library programs and services, especially collections, digital initiatives & space

### Peer Examples

- Brandeis, Brown, Dartmouth, Cornell (all except med)

### Uniquely Enables for Tufts Faculty and Students

- Maintains excellent curricular services for students and faculty and other unique discipline-based user services provided by locally-based Research & Instruction librarians
- Innovative services that assist faculty particularly in the research process (e.g. research data management, data analytics, visualization)
- New services at school-based libraries that highlight unique specializations (e.g., bioinformatics specialization in HHSL, digital humanities in Tisch) are designed
- Initiatives that align with changes in scholarly communication are implemented (e.g., experimentation with e-texts and new publishing methods, ensuring fair use)
- Up-to-date digital library capabilities are widely available to facilitate research and teaching (e.g., digital objects and interactive products that support digital scholarship, new discovery platforms and tools, data description and curation, linked data that supports research)
- Library spaces are transformed from warehouse to academic center for knowledge creation (e.g., digital and multimedia production, professional practice and maker spaces)
- Access to a “collective collection” in the Boston area and beyond achieved through a variety of external collaborations

### Uniquely Enables Library Infrastructure for a Research University

- Visionary leadership to create a strategic research library for the 21st century
- Aligns with University’s Strategic Plan and initiatives, and supports school plans
- Maintains strong relationships with the schools
- Develops University-wide library strategic plan, vetted by University and school administrators and faculty, includes:
  - Libraries-wide staffing plan
  - Space and facility planning for all library buildings/facilities
  - Digital/information management and technology planning in partnership w/ TTS
- In position of strength as a strategic partner with other Boston-area academic institutions and in selected national initiatives
- Adapts library staffing and expertise to new priorities and needs for the libraries overall
- “Rightscales” resource utilization
- Intentionally increases financial support for the libraries, especially through fund-raising

### Engaged Leadership on campus and externally

- Consider creating a University Library Steering Committee (Provost’s Office, school administrators and faculty) to advise the UL
- Consider creating either school-based Library Committees and/or population-based Library Committees
- University Librarian joins Academic Council, Provost’s Council, and Administrative Council
- School librarians participate in school academic and administrative groups
- Increase libraries participation in groups such as Research and Graduate Programs Council, Information Technology Advisory Council
- Consider initiating a Board of Advisors for University Libraries (or possibly, University Libraries and Technology Services)
- University Librarian represents all of Tufts libraries in all organizations, except those exclusive to specific schools or functions
- Tufts libraries lead significant collaborative ventures, regionally and nationally

### Challenges

- Requires experienced UL with vision, effective leadership and partnerships skills and outward focus
- Significant change agenda may not be fully embraced by all stakeholders
- Necessity of demonstrating continuous value to schools and other stakeholders to justify support
- Need to establish effective communication with and accountability to schools
- Most current challenges minimized

### Change in Investment

- Add University Librarian position (possibly reallocate an existing senior library position)
- Reallocate a position for library technology strategy development
- Increase and, when appropriate, “right-scale” subject liaisons
- Grow staffing in digital libraries/ information management and new media
- Potentially reallocate positions within the libraries by minimizing reporting layers
- Continuously reallocate/redesign vacant library positions to new priorities
- Gain efficiencies in human resources from sunsetting ULC subgroups

### Time to Realization

- Ramp up time: 6 – 12 months
- Realization: 3 – 5 years
SCENARIO 4: STRATEGIC INTEGRATION, LIBRARIES AS A COMMON GOOD
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Recommendations and Rationale

The four scenarios proposed for the Tufts libraries by DJA Consulting start by building on the libraries’ strengths. Librarians based in the individual schools play an important role in supporting the school’s curriculum and academic programs and, in particular, Research & Instruction librarians are seen as partners in the teaching and learning process. The continuation of user-centered libraries and services customized responsively to the disciplines of the separate schools is an essential element of all of the scenarios. Additionally, administrators as well as faculty appreciate the strong relationships that have been built with library staff and value having librarians embedded within the school’s administrative and curricular activities. Continuing to build relationships with school faculty and administrators is another fundamental element of all scenarios.

Where the scenarios differ is in the ability to use organizational structure to leverage opportunities that the Tufts libraries could take advantage of without compromising – indeed, possibly even enhancing – these strengths. The four scenarios outline different structural approaches on a continuum that allow the libraries to have a stronger administrative center without lessening service to the schools. Inspired by library organizational models seen in other peer and aspirant peer institutions, on a continuum these scenarios develop a library infrastructure for a research university. The opportunities afforded by building new infrastructure could include, for example, planning that responds to both the T-10 University-wide vision as well as individual school initiatives, visionary leadership and effective decision-making coupled with clear authority and accountability, eliminating boundaries to enable greater economies of scale and the ability to reallocate and redesign positions for new needs, streamlining cumbersome financial practices, stabilizing funding and intentionally increasing library fund-raising and development.

In addition to these elements of leadership and administrative infrastructure, the scenarios underscore the importance of opportunities related to digital libraries and information management. Tufts new IT operating model, that sees library technology as part of a complex ecosystem, strengthens the overall expertise and support available from back-end library systems to front-end access to collections and services responsive to the community’s information needs. There is also much to be gained from having visionary University IT leadership, willing to partner with the libraries. Yet there is now a significant lack of expertise embedded within the libraries at a time when new approaches to research, scholarly communication, publishing, information and data management and digital collections are being developed on a daily basis. Indeed, research libraries are eclipsing the period of e-resources to be campus leaders and partners in digital scholarship. As seen in peer institutions, digital scholarship employs multi-media documents or objects that may include data, interpretations, visualization, maps, graphs, charts and conclusions, in a dynamic and interactive package; scholars use digital evidence and digital methods of inquiry, research, publication and preservations to achieve research goals. As today’s library is, in reality, a digital library supporting digital scholarship, a research library infrastructure requires one or more individuals – not to “manage” technology, but to understand where and how to leverage
technology to realize emerging opportunities. The Tufts libraries need staff embedded within the libraries, aside from the library administrators, who can recognize opportunities to leverage and support digital scholarship, develop a strategic vision, and communicate needs that can be realized through a partnership with TTS.

Of course, the point of building infrastructure is to enable the libraries to take greater advantage of opportunities that can have a positive impact on the Tufts community of library users. Again, on a continuum, the four scenarios outline several significant potential outcomes for users with a strong emphasis on enhancing how the libraries can contribute to Tufts research mission and better support faculty research practices. Changes in scholarly communication are creating many new opportunities for libraries to impact research, teaching and learning processes from better discovery of resources (publications, media, people, places and things) to new methods of publishing, dissemination, preservation and perpetual access, to supporting digital scholarship to changing the nature and use of library spaces. As each scenario evolves in its University-wide strategic focus and integration of services that are shared across the libraries, the resulting benefits for users include ensuring access to quality core collections across the University, better enabling cross-disciplinary support, enhancing access to Tufts unique resources and intellectual assets (e.g., special collections, theses & dissertations, archival material), innovative services that assist faculty, particularly in the research process (e.g., data management and data analytics) plus new services at school-based libraries that highlight unique specializations (e.g., bioinformatics specialization in HHSL and digital humanities in Tisch).

To enable Tufts to pursue these opportunities and be positioned for others in the future, DJA Consulting strongly recommends that Tufts University pursue Scenario 4: Strategic Integration, Libraries for the Common Good. This scenario best aligns with Tufts’ aspiration as a major research university, to create and sustain a 21st century research library that is integrated into the University mission, aligned with the University’s strategic agenda, offering excellent user services customized to various disciplines and improved support for Tufts’ research mission with contemporary initiatives – such as data and information management, new methods of scholarly communication, facilitation of new learning spaces, and more. With the appointment of a visionary University Librarian to guide a single integrated system of libraries, this scenario also positions Tufts to collaborate with external partners in meaningful endeavors. The integration of the library programs and services envisioned in this model is similar to recent changes undertaken campus-wide for integration of technology services.

If the University prefers to take a more transitional approach to better position the libraries to support the changing vision and goals, then DJA Consulting recommends that Tufts pursue Scenario 3: Users Local, Collections Central. This scenario is a win-win, reflecting Tufts’ affinity for strong local relationships and customized user services administered within each school while centralizing all elements of collection services, both print and digital, to enhance the libraries’ support for research activities and for collections that serve growing interdisciplinary needs across the entire university. With the appointment of a University Librarian with the authority to make decisions on behalf of Tufts’ libraries as a whole and with responsibility to
transform collections and develop new services in support of changes in scholarly communication, digital libraries and information management, the libraries would benefit from efficiencies and the opportunity to reallocate resources toward new priorities.

As consultants who pride ourselves on customizing every engagement to the unique organizational culture of the client, we would be remiss not to mention that Scenario 3 is most consistent with Tufts’ culture and builds on existing strengths. However, we stand behind our recommendation for strong consideration of Scenario 4 as the most desirable in the long-run. In our assessment of the various decentralized models employed by other research libraries, interviewees felt that they were not effectively achieving a shared university-wide strategic vision and alignment. Peers in decentralized organizational models also noted that they were not maximizing resources in areas that the representatives of the individual libraries were unable to coordinate successfully. Scenario 3 is a relatively new hybrid organizational model which none of Tufts’ peers has employed. After much study and lengthy implementation, Harvard has embraced a similar model of “shared services” combined with a central library as proposed in Scenario 3, but their experience is still new and the return on investment is yet to be fully understood. Tufts Ginn Library currently uses a variation on Scenario 3, with Ginn focusing on user and administrative services while Tisch handles Ginn’s collection management services; this seems to be working successfully and some elements are already in place that could facilitate wider use of this approach at Tufts.

**DJA Consulting offers, but is reluctant to endorse, Scenario 2: Main Library + Spokesperson that outlines the least change to Tufts’ current configuration of libraries.** This scenario provides little additional value, but does enable some increased clarity in decision-making with the appointment of a University Librarian (UL). In this scenario the UL is a spokesperson for the University but does not have direct oversight or decision-making authority beyond the Tisch Library and the University Library Council (ULC). The current inefficiencies related to the informal agreements between libraries and complex decision-making at the school-based level on behalf of the respective libraries is not addressed in this scenario; the libraries will remain challenged to support University-wide initiatives and respond to changes in scholarly communication, digital libraries and information management.

**Scenario 1: School-based Libraries maintains the status quo; DJA Consulting does not recommend that this organizational model for the libraries be continued.** While Tufts achieves excellent curricular services and deeply valued relationships at the individual school level, the University incurs opportunity costs associated with an inability to build the infrastructure needed to forge a viable 21st century research library commensurate with a 21st century research university. The DJA Consulting review indicates that Tufts is the only institution among its peers and aspirant peers with an entirely school-based library system, lacking a designated main/university library and a designated University Librarian with insufficient research-intensive digital library and information management programs and services available across the University.
DJA Consulting proposes that the libraries funding model align with the selected organizational model. In those areas where the individual schools administer (or jointly administer) library programs and services, such as local user services, then the school would continue to fund the associated staff and activities. In those areas where a University Librarian, reporting to the Provost’s Office, administers (or jointly administers) library programs and services, such as collections or other fully integrated services, then the budget lines would be reallocated. In those areas where the Provost’s Office administers central services and staffing, such as a University Librarian position and the existing Digital Collections and Archives, then the funding would be allocated from the overall “tax” on the schools for university-wide programs and services. This financial model is commonly employed by schools practicing Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) where the library is often treated as a university-wide service and resource, similar to Tufts Technology Service (TTS). Several of these funding model elements align with those employed at other research institutions (Cornell, Dartmouth, Harvard, Washington University). DJA Consulting recommends that Service Level Agreements be established that define schools’ expectations and establish accountability for the libraries.

A more complex situation to address going forward is Tufts’ overall financial support for libraries. The average libraries’ expenditures among the institutions reviewed in the peer benchmarking is close to $25M, with a range from $7M (Brandeis) to $39M (Duke). Tufts total library expenditures, reported as just over $17M, was the third lowest of the nine peers. While collections (materials) expenditures are on a par with some peers (Brown, Dartmouth), the level of library staffing shows the most disparity from peers. The range of FTE professional staff reported by Tufts’ peer institutions is from 24 (Brandeis) to 203 (Cornell). Tufts professional staff, reported as 43FTE, is the second lowest of the peers. The central library system or main library at most of Tufts’ peer institutions derives significant funding from endowments and gifts, ranging from 10%-30%, primarily for library collections. DJA Consulting notes that organizational models that employ a University Librarian to cultivate external relationships maximize the opportunity for effective fund-raising and development. Additionally, models that integrate activities that occur in multiple libraries offer the possibility of achieving efficiencies and reallocating resources to new priorities. While these systemic solutions may ameliorate some financial challenges faced by the Tufts’ libraries, attention needs to be paid to developing funding for significant contemporary priorities such as space renovations, digital collections, information management technology, and staffing.

DJA Consulting posits that Tufts is currently at a disadvantage in not keeping pace with contemporary research libraries. As the University seeks to attract students - who have been exposed to more updated library facilities - and world-class faculty - who have been exposed to more research support services and more digital collections of primary sources, for example - the discrepancy between Tufts’ libraries and those at other institutions could affect recruitment. If the status quo is maintained, faculty who have become familiar with other quality research libraries before joining Tufts could become dissatisfied with the programs and services available to them. There could be negative impacts on the libraries that might affect users as well. The uncommon structure and approaches employed at Tufts could dissuade quality candidates from joining the libraries’ staff or discourage exceptional staff from
remaining in Tufts employment, thereby weakening the libraries’ capacities going forward. Additionally, the structure could limit the libraries from being a serious participant in external collaborations with peer research libraries, jeopardizing Tufts opportunity to benefit from a rapidly growing trend in the changing information environment.

Clearly there are many factors to be considered in determining the organizational and funding models for the Tufts libraries today and for the future.

**Process, Choices and Next Steps**

The documents and guidance provided by DIA Consulting are the result of intensive and focused analysis and represent best practices in the field, trends in the research library community and our thoughtful consideration of Tufts’ unique organizational culture. Though we encourage a shift to either *Scenario 3* or *Scenario 4*, the adoption of any new model—regardless of its attractive qualities—will require a carefully designed and implemented change management process. A straightforward visual is shown below, reflecting the need for alignment between strategy, structure and organizational culture. More importantly, this model underscores that all efforts should be in the service of the organization’s strategy—in this case, the University’s vision and T-10 Strategic Plan priorities.

![A Model for High Performance](image-url)
A successful change management process for the libraries, particularly considering the University’s overall objectives, will need to be clearly scoped, communicated and supported by the ULC and other key stakeholders, especially school administrators.

1. Determine the desired identity and vision for the Tufts libraries. This seems like a straightforward suggestion but it is actually quite a challenge for many libraries. For Tufts, given its shift from a New England, school-based college to a prominent research university, it is important that a clear and shared vision for the libraries’ future be articulated and used to anchor choices about structure and investment.

2. Next are the essential questions to be considered:
   a. How do the libraries want to be positioned on campus and beyond?
   b. To what extent will the libraries contribute to the core University goals particularly as related to collections (print and digital), service, innovation and digital infrastructure?

3. Choose the preferred structure and funding approach from the proposed scenarios or build one à la carte. Each of the scenarios presented in this document are offered based on a rigorous process and thoughtful construction of distinct and viable options. However, Tufts may decide to select elements of different scenarios to pursue, or along a timeline that allows incremental implementation rather than immediate full adoption of a particular approach.

4. After a preferred structure and approach are confirmed, identify which libraries will initially (or eventually) be incorporated into the structure.
5. Consider leadership and key staffing needs given the selected scenario.
6. Flesh out all levels of the organizational structure.
   a. An important process consideration at this, and all stages, is to decide how to involve additional key stakeholders in developing a more detailed design of the new structure. It is the Consultants’ experience that this work is often coordinated in conjunction with the University’s Human Resources department.
   b. Beyond the staffing, reporting and funding, additional horizontal structures should be selected. Horizontal structures will include the identification of positions and/or groups that will provide lateral communication and decision-making.

Though the guidance about the process for implementing the model of Tufts’ choosing is beyond the scope of this engagement, the Consultants encourage broad discussion and shared understanding at the outset of any change management endeavor. Framing these discussions with Guiding Principles (what the libraries must be able to do as a result of the change) and Assumptions (what the new structure must be able to do) have been effectively used in other research libraries undergoing similar processes for establishing a shared foundation upon which to build.

**Conclusion**

The Tufts University community appears ready to accept change in the organizational and funding models for the libraries. Conversations with over forty key stakeholders from across the University, plus other input provided to the consultants, generally indicates a willingness to implement changes as long as there is an assurance that any newly adopted model offers additional value and does not result in degradation of current school-based user-centered library services. While there is, naturally, an element of reluctance and some concerns to address, Tufts’ culture of collaboration and good will coupled with the ambitious vision of the T-10 Strategic Plan lend overall support to future positive changes for the libraries.

A new Tufts’ libraries organizational model will build upon the past strengths of the school-based model and will emphasize the intersections—between customers and service providers, among units within the libraries’ system, between and across units on all campuses, and with libraries and academic institutions beyond Tufts. Additionally, the selected model will hopefully underscore that library staff roles will not be limited only to a school, but rather will recognize that there is a spectrum of library expertise and contributions across the University.
Appendices

Appendix A: Campus Sentiment

This section represents selected quotes gathered from stakeholders during DJA Consulting’s interviews, tours and meetings. We felt them important to include in this document as a reflection, from your internal stakeholders, of their feelings about change to the libraries’ organization. The quotes are divided into three main categories:

1) the feelings about and level of support for change to the libraries’ organization,
2) issues that need to be addressed in any change to the libraries’ organization, and
3) skepticism about change.

Additional quotes received from internal stakeholders and those from University Librarians at peer institutions are included in the auxiliary Peer Benchmarking and Qualitative Analysis reports. [Quotes gathered and shared in this report are labeled according to the classification of the individual providing each statement (University administration, Schools’ administration, Libraries’ administration, and Faculty) and correspond with Appendix B. List of Interviewees].

Support for Change to Libraries’ Organization

“It is definitely time to think about changing the libraries’ structure. We have to be one University. A culture shift is happening as we transform from a quiet school to a Research I university. It’s time to put a secure framework in place.” (University)

“We need the boundaries we have in place now at Tufts to go away, including those in the libraries. It’s not effective for one library to implement a program and say ‘it’s ours, for our school only.’” (University)

“At this time at Tufts, we want managers and librarians who are capable of building strong partnerships, not carving out separate islands. This is a complex environment in a complex time. It’s an opportunity to think creatively.” (University)

“Libraries are one of the areas where it makes sense to have a stronger administrative center. Faculty should not have to be aware of or care about the organizational structure of the libraries as long as there is not a negative impact to their local service. A stronger library system could provide better sharing of resources and coordination of programs, better services and economies of scale; plus provide better challenges to publishers to address the rising costs of resources.” (School)

“Since faculty utilize more than one of the libraries [because of the interdisciplinary nature of their work], a University Librarian is a reasonable thing to consider.” (School)

“Having a University Librarian would allow me to focus on service to my school.” (Library)

“In some ways the Tisch Library has become the de facto main library by taking on a lot of the initiatives that we want to do collectively. But, it’s time to give this centralization a push.” (Library)
“Want to have core central services.” (Library)

**Service Issues to Address in any Change to Libraries’ Organization**

“This is a complicated time at Tufts. Some things are calming down but there are some issues. For the libraries, we need to consider what will allow us to be more efficient but that doesn’t hurt service.” (University)

“I’m agnostic about the organizational model as long as we get the same level of excellent service.” (School)

“The most important thing is to have our public services staff here, located in the school and close to our community and able to respond to any person who has a need. If our public services library staff are not locally-based, that would be disastrous and there would be a lot of push-back. We need people on the front lines interacting with our users and understanding their needs.” (School)

“There’s unlikely to be strong feelings from faculty about changes to the libraries’ organization as long as they continue to have access to desired information materials. If things are made more complicated in access to e-resources, however, then there would be push-back. It’s integral to part of everyday life to use e-resources.” (School)

“Physically and functionally the library is an integrated part of the school and we don’t want that to change.” (School)

“Centralization of librarians, other resources and materials would be detrimental to teaching and research. Librarians who are subject-area experts are critical for staffing.” (Faculty)

“Do not want in-house resources and librarians moved elsewhere to a central location or staffing to be cut.” (Faculty)

“Would like at the school libraries to be able to focus only on reference, education, service to faculty and students and not have to do administrative tasks, like budget management.” (Library)

**Leadership and Accountability Issues to Address in any Change to Libraries’ Organization**

“The concept of a University Librarian who would be able to represent all library issues at the highest levels makes some sense. It underscores the importance of what libraries do, the support of research efforts across the University; research is critical to everything we do at the University. And perhaps there are some economies that are not being realized. In principal, it’s a good idea. But on the next level, not sure about reporting and funding changes. Need to have certain understandings about local control and about what our library does in support of the students and faculty of our school.” (School)

“If the model changes, need to have confidence in the librarian that will be making the decisions, confidence that different needs will be balanced.” (School)
“A single medical library seems to be good for three separate schools so it’s doesn’t seem to be necessary for every school to have its own library. But have to assure each school of certain things. You can secure the school relationship without having direct control.” (University)

“Would not be opposed to more centralization of the libraries and even providing the resources from the schools. The library is a place where that makes a lot of sense. The question is accountability. Who’s going to be accountable to the school?” (School)

“Have a certain degree of open-mindedness, but some skepticism about decisions that lack transparency. How much of a problem do we have? How quickly does it have to be resolved? Is this immediate or longer term, something we can work toward? TTS is showing us that there are ways that it can work and is working. A lot depends on leadership styles. Maybe identify the strengths and have a leadership matrix. We want to have good relationships. And we’re quite willing to work it out.” (School)

“We need to think more holistically. What’s the right investment for the University in collections/journals? What directions are we taking the libraries in going forward?” (School)

“The nature of the leadership would be critical. What I don't want to see is the community and the culture change. We are part of the fabric of the school. How do you preserve a strong sense of culture, the foundation within our community?” (Library)

“It would be very expensive to add a senior administrator at the top of the existing organization structure. We would need to reorganize how things are shaped currently. We could look to the Harvard Library as a possible model, with the same individual serving as the head of the multi-library structure and also of the Harvard College Library. But we would want to be sure that the system was not lopsided toward the largest unit.” (Library)

“I'm a little worried about losing some autonomy if we change the libraries organization but I think we can work it out. We’ve known many of the staff of the libraries a long time so we can talk about things.” (Library)

“I would be concerned about adding a Dean of the Libraries without also adding an administrative structure, including technical and systems expertise, to support effective decision-making. Without that, it would be very easy to create something like a Holy Roman Emperor, dependent on the existing structure for information and authority. It is hard to see how that, by itself, would change much.” (Library)

**Structure and Reporting Issues to Address in any Change to Libraries’ Organization**

“If Tufts has a University Librarian, that position has to report to the Provost. Possibly even be appointed as a Vice Provost. Must be involved in the Academic Council with the Provost staff and Deans and might also participate in the Administrative Council with the VPs and EADs. I can’t imagine that a University Librarian who’s committed to developing a vibrant library system supporting the research of faculty and students would not be well received.” (School)
“I think the organization of the libraries could work in a way that’s similar to Advancement or Facilities. There is a central structure, the staff report centrally. But there are lateral lines. That works pretty well. Anything that touches the core academic programs needs to have a huge component at the level of the schools but that could be accomplished with dotted lines.” (School)

“Think the local library staff should report up through the Dean, certainly with a dotted line to a University Librarian. I would be nervous about having them all report to the University Librarian and not to the schools, possibly having their attention diverted, skewed toward other areas, that would give me pause.” (School)

“No matter who’s reporting to whom, a librarian has to continue to be at the table with the schools’ deans at all of our meetings. This has to happen. The librarian can report elsewhere but has to stay connected and be in close coordination with the schools.” (School)

“Could imagine a University Librarian with school libraries remaining independent, but still sharing resources.” (Library)

“Can’t see school libraries reporting to a University Librarian. A UL would want their people and the schools would be at risk to lose positions that triage issues, manage relationships, etc.” (Library)

“Cannot imagine centralizing or sharing Public Services staff.” (Library)

“Possibly could report in 2 directions – to my Dean and to University Librarian. A UL would go to bat for me and bring more weight to the libraries and even to my Dean.” (Library)

“The libraries need strong relationships with the schools, such as we have with the public service librarians.” (Library)

“Worry about being buried too low in the organization and about having layers that would make communication and sharing of resources more difficult.” (Library)

“Could continue to have separate school libraries, but cooperative. Could have a University Librarian with university-wide programs like the online catalog, special collections and archives as direct reports. These are important programs for the University and the libraries to have but they are not important at the school level.” (Library)

“Possibly a more difficult question than whether or not we have a University Librarian is the configuration of the next layer, AULs. Maybe a strong AUL back-end can complement the forward-facing public services of the local libraries. There’s a lot that will have to be worked out with that.” (Library)

“Fear the loss of the team structure. That’s of value to the library staff.” (Library)

**Funding Issues to Address in any Change to Libraries’ Organization**

“There are concerns about loss of budget flexibility that schools have now vis-à-vis library funding and about accountability.” (University)
“It makes sense to do things centrally, to move the library budgets to central. But can’t have it both ways. Can’t give the budget and then get an assessment on top of that. And if there are vacancies, who gets the savings and what’s the accountability if there’s a drop in service?” (School)

“Hope a University Librarian position would not be funded out of the schools, but from other sources.” (School)

“We are all concerned as a public about rising costs. Layering in more levels of Administration doesn’t do anything to reduce costs. The only way that an organizational change should happen is if we can save money.” (School)

“Now the libraries do not generate revenue. It’s possible that they could get gifts, donations, etc.” (School)

“Reference librarians and library staff are the first priority. Cuts should not be made to staffing either to add technology or space.” (Faculty)

“I’m hoping that the libraries go to a different structure that would enable us to do budgeting differently. It would be better if we pooled all of our collections funding into one fund. It would eliminate this silly work of dividing the costs among the schools and the internal billing of things like memberships, databases, e-journals.” (Library)

Information Technology Issues to Address in any Change to Libraries’ Organization

“Where we need to focus is on a strategic vision about information management and to understand how to leverage technology. We need someone in the libraries, a director of libraries, with a vision for the future, someone that really knows where and how technology can transform that vision into reality. Then turn to TTS to work together to enable that to happen.” (University)

“If the libraries had a University Librarian, reporting to a trusted leader like the Provost, it would likely enhance the working relationship with TTS. The discussion about library-related IT would happen differently than it has recently. A University Librarian would amplify the priorities regarding information management and as the person accountable would want to have direct influence on those priorities with TTS.” (University)

“Libraries have to be about the academic mission of the University, but with a dotted line to IT.” (University)

“The libraries and TTS need to work hand in hand. Whatever the recommendations are for the libraries, have to articulate how the libraries will work with TTS. It has to be explicitly addressed in the org chart, with detail, ‘here’s how your two groups will work together’. This working relationship needs to be well supported.” (Library)

Value Issues to Address in any Change to Libraries’ Organization

“We are all for centralization if it’s going to add value. You have to convince us that it is going to add value. We don't want to just change for its own sake.” (School)
“No objection. But, what do we benefit from this?” (School)

“No sure about changing the libraries’ organization. Concern with central control is that things move slowly, it’s not as easy to get things done. Would that add another layer of bureaucracy? Because currently, the library is very responsive to our needs. It’s a lean operation now and the return seems quite high. The system seems like it works very well now.” (School)

_Skepticism about Change to Libraries Organization_

“Things are not broken at Tufts. To what end do we need a University Librarian? Not sure if this isn’t just another layer of bureaucracy. Tufts has always been under-resourced, scrappy. Can we have the rationality without the centralization? Look at what’s in the best interests of the University and how to make that happen.” (School)

“There are absolutely no challenges in our library that make it to the level of the Dean’s attention. Don’t want to disturb that tranquility. Don’t rock the boat.” (School)

“Our librarian is great. We’re on a campaign to save our librarian.” (School)

“I’m very interested in what our librarian thinks. Our librarian lives it every day.” (School)

“Faculty like the status quo.” (Faculty)

“We have a tradition of localism. Keep things localized. Don’t want to see changes to the libraries organizationally if it’s about efficiencies. I could do with less efficiency and more local control. It came across unanimously among the Tisch Faculty Library Committee: keep things localized. And this is felt just as strongly at other libraries as Tisch. The status quo is working.” (Faculty)
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LeRoy (Lee) LaFleur, Associate Director of Library Services, Edwin Ginn Library (The Fletcher School)
Betsy Like, Manager, The Webster Family Library (Cummings School of Veterinary Medicine)
Ellen McDonald, Associate Librarian, Edwin Ginn Library (The Fletcher School)
Dorothy Meaney, Manager, Administration and Finance, Tisch Library
Rebecca Morin, Associate Librarian, Head, Research & Instruction, Hirsh Health Sciences Library
Alicia Morris, Head, Technical Services, Tisch Library
Cynthia Rubino, Director, Library and Information Services, Edwin Ginn Library (The Fletcher School)
Dan Santamaria, Director and University Archivist, Digital Collections & Archives
Evan Simpson, Head, Research & Instruction, Tisch Library
Laura Walters, Associate Director, Collections & User Services, Tisch Library
Eliot Wilczek, University Records Manager, Digital Collections & Archives
Laura Wood, Director, Tisch Library
Faculty: Tisch Faculty Library Committee - December 2, 2014 Meeting with DJA

Daniel Abramson, Associate Professor, Art & Art History
David Ekbladh, Associate Professor, History
Valencia Joyner-Koomson, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Ning Ma, Assistant Professor, German, Russian, and Asian Languages & Literatures
Chris Rogers, Professor, Mechanical Engineering

Faculty: Tisch Faculty Library Committee - November 5, 2014 Meeting (Minutes provided to DJA Consultants)

Committee Members:
Daniel Abramson (Chair), Art and Art History
Sam Thomas, Chemistry
Michael Reed, Biology
Matt Panzer, Chemical Engineering
Chris Rogers, Mechanical Engineering
Sophie Pearlman, TCU Senate Representative
Janna Karatas, TCU Senate Representative
Rachael Bonoan, GSC Representative

Faculty Guests:
Sulmaan Khan, International History and Chinese Foreign Relations, The Fletcher School
Michael Klein, International Economic Affairs, The Fletcher School
Lynne Ausman, International Nutrition, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy and Jean Mayer USDA Human Nutrition Research Center on Aging
Ralph Aarons, Harvey Learning Community and Director, Problem-Based Learning Program,
John Castellot, Integrative Physiology and Pathobiology
Will Masters, Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy and Economics
Cailin Heinze, Clinical Nutrition, Cummings School of Veterinary Medicine

External Interviewees: Peer Benchmarking

John Unsworth, Vice Provost, University Librarian and Chief Information Officer, Brandeis University
Harriette Hemmasi, Joukowsky Family University Librarian, Brown University
Arnold Hirshon, Associate Provost and University Librarian, Case Western Reserve University
Anne Kenney, Carl A. Kroch University Librarian, Cornell University
Jeffrey Horrell, Librarian of the College, Dartmouth College
Deborah Jakubs, Rita DiGialionardo Holloway University Library & Vice Provost for Library Affairs, Duke University
Artemis Kirk, University Librarian, Georgetown University
Sarah Pritchard, Dean of Libraries, Northwestern University
Jeffrey Trecziak, University Librarian, Washington University – St. Louis
Appendix C: Harvard Library

A case study of University-wide central “shared services” and school-based “local” user services

While not a Tufts peer institution, per se, the Harvard University libraries provide an interesting case study in organizational change. In 2008 Harvard had 73 libraries in 54 locations across the University. The libraries operated within the academic unit that they most directly supported – from professional schools, to Arts & Sciences, to specific academic departments and research centers – and each library had its own organizational structure and funding mechanism. A separate unit, the Harvard University Library, reporting to the President and the Provost, was a central service provider for information technology, high-density physical storage, University archives and records management, preservation, and campus-wide scholarly communication and open access policies. A University Library Council was an advisory body for the HUL Director, who chaired the ULC meetings with voluntary participation of the head librarians of each of the professional school faculties and senior staff of Harvard College Library. The ULC worked through four tiers of committees – coordinating committees, standing committees, working groups, and affinity groups.

There was an awareness at the University that Harvard’s libraries collectively were in danger of falling behind in the rapidly changing information environment. The incumbent University Provost appointed and chaired a Task Force on University Libraries to “examine the library system and make recommendations that would put it on a footing that could sustain and ideally enhance its excellence long into the future.”

The Case for Change at Harvard

The report of the Task Force on University Libraries report, issued in 2009, noted:

“The Harvard library structure is unique among great universities for its degree of decentralization and its often internally incompatible modes of operation. While the University has an overarching library body, the Harvard University Library (HUL), most of the 73 constituent libraries are funded by and report to the different faculties of the University or to departments within them. Perpetuation of the current administrative structure promises to hold the University captive to frozen accidents of history, rather than facilitating the development of new strengths and fostering an agile organization for the twenty-first century. ... While highly distributed decision making undoubtedly contributed to the rich and varied development of Harvard’s collections, it has also contributed to dissimilar library policies and practices, to incompatible and different modes of operation, to the inhibition of flexible and forward-looking responses to intellectual and technological opportunities, to impeding the University’s ability to aggregate its buying power even in the face of monopolistic journal publishers, and to incurring increasingly unsupportable costs. Its unwieldy governance no longer aligns well with the current needs of scholarship, where disciplinary boundaries have broken down and digital technology has created a virtual space that extends across the entire University and indeed, the entire world.”

The Task Force issued five recommendations:

1. Establish and implement a shared administrative infrastructure.
2. Rationalize and **enhance our information technology systems**.
3. **Revamp the financial model** for the Harvard libraries.
4. Rationalize our system for acquiring, accessing, and developing materials for a “single university” collection.
5. Collaborate more ambitiously with peer libraries and other institutions.

Harvard’s then-Provost concluded “libraries the world over are undergoing a challenging transition into the digital age, and Harvard’s libraries are no exception. The Task Force report points us toward a future in which our libraries must be able to work together far more effectively than is the case today as well as to collaborate with other great libraries to maximize access to the materials needed by our scholars.” To implement the Task Force recommendation, the University decided to establish a coordinated management structure and increasingly focus resources on the opportunities presented by new information technology.

**Harvard’s Initial Libraries’ Organizational Structure**

Beginning in 2012, Harvard implemented a new organizational structure for the libraries. The new Harvard Library organization became part of the University’s central administrative structure and was charged with “establishing the capacity to develop and execute on strategic initiatives to ensure the Library is positioned for the future... [by] investing in innovation, digital infrastructure, collections and talent to continue to offer unparalleled services.” The specific focus areas include:

- Collaborative collection development.
- IT as a driver of the Library becoming an engine of innovation.
- Creating an innovative culture, and an infrastructure to support it.
- Intensified commitment to scholarly communications, digital curation, preservation and unlocking the Library’s unique resources.
- Providing Library staff with the information, resources and technology they need to support research, teaching and learning at Harvard in even better ways.”

Within the new Harvard Library structure, a “**Shared Services**” organization was developed that **unified functions that occurred within all libraries and were University-wide**. All of the libraries’ “held-in-common” work was integrated into the Harvard Library’s Shared Services structure including: Access Services (circulation, etc.), Information and Technical Services (cataloging, etc.), Preservation, Conservation and Digital Imaging and the Harvard University Archives. Staff with responsibilities in these areas from across all of the University’s libraries were reassigned to the Harvard Library (most continued to remain physically in their original locations). These central services are delivered to each of the libraries based on an **agreed-upon level of service, initially documented in Service Level Agreements.** Some administrative support services (Finance, Communications, Human Resources) were also provided centrally by the Harvard Library, augmented by administrative support within some of the school libraries and the schools. The Harvard Library’s **central administrative structure initially included a Senior Associate Provost, an Executive Director, managers for each of the four shared service areas, and an administrative staff** (Exhibit 1 below).

The University’s individual libraries were considered to be part of the Harvard Library through a set of management teams and cross-unit working groups (see below). The library directors and staff –
excluding the reassigned Shared Services staff - continued to report to their respective schools and departments. These libraries maintained the “local library services”, those services related to research, teaching and learning and for the development of the collections. Local services were customized to the disciplines and community of the school.

Library Technology Services became a division of the central Harvard University Information Technology and works in collaboration with the Harvard Library. Library Technology Services develops and maintains enterprise library software applications. Systems and services include search, discovery and e-research; collection management systems for Library staff, the Digital Repository, Preservation Services and Access Services; digital project support; and reporting services for Library data and metadata.

Continuing to Develop and Streamline the new Organizational Structure

Less than two years into the new structure, there were a number of changes in senior leadership. Both the Senior Associate Provost and the Executive Director were replaced by a single Vice President for the Harvard Library, reporting to the Provost. Within six months, the incumbent was also named Librarian for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, to oversee and coordinate all FAS libraries, including Harvard College Library, with a dual report to the Dean of FAS.

In 2014, the libraries’ organizational structure was further integrated with the recommendation that the senior management team of the Harvard Library “shared services” organization and the FAS Harvard College Library become a united management team to overs the operational aspects of both. The collective management team shares commitments to achieve the mission and goals of both the central infrastructure serving all schools and the University’s largest/main library in FAS. The streamlined senior management team includes the Vice President/ Librarian for FAS and leaders of divisions for Collections; Research, Teaching and Learning; Information and Technical Services; Preservation, Conservation and Digital Imaging; and Administration and Finance (Exhibit 2 below).

Integrating Independent School/Departmental Libraries into the Structure

The 2009 Report of the Task Force on University Libraries had also noted these issues related to the organizational structure at that time:

“...the number of independent library units and the complexity of decision-making authority consume extraordinary amounts of staff time and energy that would be better invested in client services. ... Though these libraries make solid efforts to work together, they each have a primary duty to further the interests of their own departments, rather than seek what might best serve the needs of the overall Harvard community.”

The original University Library Council and the extensive system of committees was replaced as part of the new Harvard Library structure. A Library Leadership Team, comprised of the senior staff of the Harvard Library and the directors of the professional school libraries and FAS, is responsible for planning, prioritizing and implementing joint initiatives. The team works with the Vice President for the Harvard Library/Librarian for FAS to develop and implement Library-wide strategy and policy. In collaboration with the Library IT Steering Committee the Leadership Team prioritizes new technology
initiatives. In collaboration with the Innovation Working Group it prioritizes innovations to be scaled. This management structure across the libraries continues today.

Initially, each library became part of a collaborative unit called an Affinity Group. Every library had a primary Affinity Group membership based on similar collection formats, similar content or service areas, and/or specialized needs and activities. All Library Heads were assigned to be part of Affinity Groups. For accountability, a Group Head was appointed to chair each Affinity Group and had a dual report to his/her primary library and to the Harvard Library Executive Director.

After a two year period, the Affinity Group structure was reconsidered. The Vice President for the Harvard Library (and later Librarian for FAS) sought a new governance structure for Harvard Library committees and groups that would support library and University priorities.

Late in 2014, a new governance committee system was launched. Standing committees relate to the libraries’ core mission and goals. **Five high-level standing committees focus on critical issues that cut across all libraries and advance Harvard Library strategic objectives.** These all report to the Harvard Library Leadership Team, chaired by the Vice President for the Harvard Library/Librarian for FAS and have a purpose, charge, and goals. The committees are:

- **Access and Discovery Standing Committee:** To enable effective access to the world of knowledge and data through intuitive discovery, networks of expertise and global collaborations.
- **Collections and Content Development Standing Committee:** To support University-wide research, teaching and learning, now and in the future, by implementing and extending the Harvard Library’s collections and content development strategy.
- **Research, Teaching and Learning Standing Committee:** To enable faculty, students and our broader community to excel in their scholarly pursuits, the RTL Standing Committee coordinates and develops the capabilities needed to position our expertise and resources in learning, teaching and research.
- **Stewardship Standing Committee:** To steward vulnerable and critical research information in partnership with academic and administrative functions across the University and beyond.
- **Professional Development Standing Committee:** To support a robust professional development network in a learning organization for library staff to achieve the strategic initiatives and the mission of the Harvard Library.

Currently under development are additional cross-unit structures including:

- **Councils** – to address issues across the spectrum of library activities, based on interests by subject or function (e.g., Science, IT)
- **Working Groups** – time-limited groups created to investigate specific problems, undertake specific tasks and recommend solutions
- **Discussion Groups** – informal groups convened for discussion and sharing expertise across the library community on topics of interest
What Can the Changes to Harvard University Libraries Structure Tell Others?

1. **An organizational change process must be driven by and be anchored to a guiding vision**
   - The compelling vision at Harvard was to better position the libraries for the changes in the information landscape in the 21st century with an emphasis on greater coordination and integration, enhancing innovation and opportunities provided by technology, and increasing external collaboration.

2. **Strong institutional commitment helps to stay the course**
   - A large scale transformation of the libraries is an institution-wide responsibility not something to be accomplished exclusively within the libraries
   - Stakeholders who hold the vision throughout, provide support, and remove barriers to change can enable the process even through the inevitable rough patches
   - When there’s turnover of individuals, the overall momentum doesn’t leave with them
   - Harvard maintained its commitment to change, even in the face of faculty concerns and library turnover

3. **Successful change requires effective leadership**
   - An effective leadership style relies on skills and behaviors like inviting engagement in the service of the organization, expecting accountability, minimizing command and control in favor of collaboration, respecting past accomplishments and loyalties while historical boundaries are eliminated, sharing information and listening, and building trust
   - The reputation and credibility of the leader matter; so do personal connections. The Harvard Library is fortunate to be led by a well-respected library professional
   - An open and transparent change process builds trust and commitment

4. **It’s not necessary to build a large central structure**
   - The Harvard Library’s initial structure was streamlined within 2 years, providing many opportunities for existing staff to make more contributions

5. **Timing a change process is difficult and change takes time**
   - It’s difficult to know how much to do, when, how fast
   - At Harvard, many transitions have happened; changes have blended over time
Harvard Library Organization Charts

Exhibit 1:

Exhibit 2:

Note: Seeking permission to include the new Harvard Library/Harvard College Library/Faculty of Arts & Sciences organization chart here.
Appendix D: Peer Benchmarking Summary

DJA consultants examined nine (9) peer or aspirant peer institutions. Seven institutions were specified by Tufts and two institutions were selected by the consultants because of the presence of medical/health sciences and public policy/international relations programs. As a whole, the peer group represents institutions with missions very similar to Tufts, however, the size and scope of the institutions, based on population, financial data and library characteristics vary considerably. Information came from recognized data sources, institutionally published information, and interviews with the highest level library administrator at each institution. Many elements of the organizational, funding, and programmatic initiatives were gathered in a high-level overview of current research library practice; this report was submitted to Tufts in December 2014.

The institutions studied are noted below, categorized according to the organizational model of the libraries.

- **CENTRALIZED: Single University Library System**
  - Brandeis
  - Brown
  - Cornell
  - Dartmouth

- **DECENTRALIZED: Main (University) Library with some School-based Libraries**
  - Case Western Reserve
  - Duke
  - Georgetown
  - Northwestern
  - Washington U

- **DECENTRALIZED: School-Based Libraries**
  - Tufts

Summary observations made by DJA Consulting about Tufts, vis-à-vis the peer institutions, are drawn from quantitative and qualitative data, and information gathered about strategy, organization, leadership and contemporary research library initiatives and from the consultants’ vast experience working within the academic and research library community.
Organization

There are two forms of organization among Tufts’ peer institutions. Four of Tufts’ peer institutions have a totally centralized system where all individual libraries are part of a single fully merged University Libraries system. The centralized systems vary in the level of formality in terms of defining the library’s relationship to schools; only one institution appears to have formal MOU agreements between the central library administration and the schools. One institution has a University-wide merged Library/IT organization. Five of Tufts’ peer institutions have a partially decentralized system consisting of a significant main library and one or more individual libraries organized within separate schools. When decentralized, the separate school-based libraries are most often Law and Medicine. Even where some school-based libraries exist, the trend over recent years has been to merge selected individual libraries into the main library organization. **Tufts University is the only institution among peers that has an entirely school-based organization for libraries.**

University Library

All Tufts’ peer institutions have designated a “University Library”. The four centralized peer institutions consider the system as a whole to be “the University Libraries”. The five peer institutions with a decentralized organization nevertheless have one element of the structure which is universally considered to be the “main library”; typically this is the library serving Arts & Sciences located on the historical main campus. **Tufts University is the only institution among peers that does not have a designated University Library.**

Library Leadership

All Tufts’ peer institutions have someone recognized as the University Librarian, even in institutions where there are separately administered school-based libraries. All of the University Librarians, except one, report to the Provost and all are included in the highest levels of the academic leadership. Some are also included in the University’s administrative leadership. All are full members of groups such as the Provost’s Group and in most cases also the Dean’s Group as well as various other significant advisory and decision-making bodies (planning and budget, for example) - this provides not only a voice for the libraries but also an ear attuned to key University priorities, initiatives, and changes so that the libraries can align accordingly. All of the library leadership titles reflect the authority and stature within the University, and include University Librarian, Vice Provost, Dean, and in one case University Librarian and CIO. The University Librarians in Tufts’ peer institutions are recognized as campus leaders within the wider academic community and externally with collaborative partners. **Tufts University is the only institution among its peers that does not have a designated University Librarian.**

Funding

Funding models at Tufts’ peer institutions generally mirror their organizational structures. The four Tufts’ peer institutions with centralized models allocate the budget for the central library system from the Provost’s Office. The other five Tufts’ peers have a hybrid model where central administration funds the main library and the schools fund the school-based libraries. [Note on funding provided by the the Provost’s Office: Provosts’ offices typically derive their unrestricted funds from “taxes” on schools and colleges. Other sources of provost offices’ funding may include things like an allocation of the institution’s State funding, a share of indirect cost revenues, or a percentage of tuition and fees. Central funds are typically designed as “educational and general” and the actual sources of funding are rarely]
spelled out to recipients other than being designated as something like “educational and general” (E&G).

The average libraries expenditures among Tufts’ peers total is close to $25M. The range of total library expenditures reported by Tufts’ peer institutions is from $7M to $39M; the median is $26,386,424 (Tufts total library expenditures are $17,215,545). The range of FTE professional staff reported by Tufts’ peer institutions is from 24 to 203; the median is 99 (Tufts professional staff is 43FTE). The central library system or main library at most of Tufts’ peer institutions derives significant funding from endowments and gifts, ranging from 10%-30%, mainly for library collections. Tufts University is the only institution among peers that has entirely school-based funding for libraries. Two peer institutions have lower total expenditures and one peer institution has fewer professional staff than Tufts. Tufts support from endowments/gifts appears low compared to peers.

Library Information Technology

All Tufts’ peer institutions have a significant Information Technology infrastructure within the central library system or main library. In many institutions the University-wide IT service provides the overall technical infrastructure of networking, email systems, server and sometimes storage support and often desktop computing support (both hardware and software). Whether or not there is University-wide IT support, all Tufts’ peers have one or more units within the central library system or main library responsible for academically-focused and library technology work (for example, Digital Technologies or Information Management) and have staff with expertise such as digital library application development. In at least one institution, the position leading Library IT has a dotted line relationship to the University’s CIO. An organizational structure that merges University-wide services for Computing/Information Technology and Libraries is not common among peers; only one Tufts peer institution has this structure. Tufts University has the least established library information technology infrastructure and fewest dedicated library IT staff among peers with its recent centralization of IT.

Centralization of Library Programs and Services

Tufts’ peer institutions with a centralized organizational model by their nature have merged and centralized all programs and services except those that are public service/customer-facing. Tufts’ peer institutions with a decentralized organizational model vary in the specific library programs and services that are centrally administered. All of the peer institutions have the capability for a single library discovery system (formerly known as the online catalog) whether the libraries are centralized or not, and these are universally administered by the central library system or main library. In a few institutions separate school-based libraries have elected to maintain separate discovery systems. At most Tufts’ peers with decentralized systems, collection management functions are duplicated within some of the separate school-based libraries. The duplicated collection management functions typically include acquisition, licensing, description/cataloging, document delivery and inter-library loan. In several peer institutions with decentralized systems, the main library performs some collection management functions for the school-based libraries. The most common centrally administered functions are acquisition and licensing and to a lesser extent description/cataloging.

Occasionally the arrangement for services is formalized by an MOU between the main library and the schools and sometimes there is a form of reimbursement from the school-based library to the main library for these activities. In all but one of the peer institutions, the main library and school-based libraries make an effort to work together on the licensing of digital resources. For these institutions the intent is to make all resources accessible to the entire campus community, although there are rare exceptions of unique and expensive resources that are licensed for a single school.
Methods vary in distributing the financial burden of support for licensed resources with the main library in decentralized systems often serving as the “safety net” when there are financial difficulties and with staff from the main library usually performing much of the work involved. *Tufts University has centralized the integrated library system, archives, and institutional repository but is the only institution among peers where the units responsible for these functions are not part of a main library. Tufts has irregularly applied centrally administered collection management functions and administrative functions.*

**Collaboration Among Campus Libraries**

Tufts’ peer institutions with a centralized organizational model by their nature enable collaboration among all campus libraries. Tufts’ peer institutions with a decentralized organizational model rely on goodwill and collegiality to develop effective inter-library relations. In all but one of the institutions with a decentralized organizational model, the University Librarian and the school-based library directors meet regularly for exchange of information and sometimes for work toward mutual goals and objectives. Only one institution indicated that there is limited to no interest in collaborative approaches among the decentralized school-based libraries. In decentralized organizations, working groups and teams across separate libraries are formed and charged by the University Librarian and the school-based library directors and are primarily used on a project-by-project basis. None of the institutions utilize formal methods of inter-library coordination such as a formal structure of multiple standing committees. The most frequently mentioned project committee with representation across separate libraries focuses on selecting and licensing electronic resources. Some peer institutions use multi-library committees for the promotion and tenure of librarians and for library staff development. *Tufts University is the only institution among peers that utilizes a formal structure of standing committees (known as the University Library Council and its subgroups) across multiple school-based libraries to facilitate library collaboration on campus.*

**External Library Collaborations**

All of Tufts’ peer institutions acknowledge the growing importance of collaboration with partners external to campus. Most are involved in an increasing number of significant national library efforts. It was noted by several interviewees that they seek partners from among institutions who share similar goals and who have a prominent known leader. *Tufts University is the only institution among its peers where commitment to inter-institutional library collaboration is managed by achieving a consensus-based decision through a multi-library committee structure (ULC).*
Insights from University Librarians at Peer and Aspirant Peer Institutions

Insights on Centralized Organizational Models

“The advantages of a central structure are that we can work together and can set coordinated services. It’s easier to come together to set goals, make decisions, and achieve goals.”

“The plus side of a central organization is that the libraries’ budget now includes all the line items (facilities, etc.) and those are administered centrally for the benefit of all priorities; if there are cuts, I can cushion some of those cuts. The downside is there’s high interest on the part of all the Deans for what they’re paying for. The real challenge is proving that you’re absolutely critical to the academic success of faculty & students of the University and the School and that you’re the most efficient and effective way to provide the infrastructure that leads to that success.”

[Before, when libraries were separate] “...some constituents thought that their own library unit was serving all their needs, however, our data shows that on average students use [many] of the libraries in a given year.”

[Some libraries] “...previously located in departments/buildings have now been incorporated into the main library. It required some political work with the faculty and some arrangements like delivery. Initially they felt they were giving up some things but then they gained lot in the end. Our librarians have offices and office hours in the departments and in some departments the faculty have key card access; the data shows that they don’t really use it but we empowered them. The department administration was happy to regain space. Even the naysayers said this has turned out really great.”

Insights on Decentralized Organizational Models

“There are some advantages to having close alignment with the schools and closer integration. There’s a sense of ownership that the school or department feels. There’s the opportunity for advocacy not only for that individual library but the advocacy that the Dean can bring to the faculty around the issues of scholarly communication, etc. And they bring their own money and it helps. If they are strong advocates for their schools, they can bring financial resources to the table.”

[In our decentralized model], “our assumption is collaboration. We assume we’re going to include the other libraries in anything we initiate. They can choose to opt out but our default is collaboration. We all work closely together, some decision-making, some financial; none of libraries gets to be isolated or act completely independently.”

[In our decentralized system] “...staff work together in a lots ways. We have a tremendously interdisciplinary University so multiple initiatives, centers and institutes, etc. are made up of teams of librarians. The library directors meet informally once/month. It can be awkward because I’m at a level that reports directly to the Provost and their Deans report to Provost [and they do not all report to their Deans]. I’m able to give them information about the University and what’s going on that they often do not get otherwise.”

“Even the President says to me, ‘you have a hard job, this [decentralization] isn’t the system that fits the University today.’ And, we can't prove that the Deans would save money by centralizing. But, it’s
not about the money; it’s about strategically moving forward. It’s not a power grab; I’d like to be able to sit down and check bags at the door and talk strategically. But the Deans and the Directors of the separate libraries are very focused on their own community. They do very special things for their community, so the community is happy. Still, it would be nice to have a strategic thinking and planning layer over all of the libraries, to think about the future together. People are ‘trading the known for the unknown;’ they fear the unknown but it could be a lot better.”

[While we have decentralized school-based libraries] “…except for Medicine, the separate libraries are essentially public services only. All of their materials are integrated into the main ILS and they receive access to all main library licensed resources. The main library does all of the ordering, receiving, processing of new materials and handles all of the inter-library loan for these libraries.”

*Insights on a University Librarian*

“The role of University Librarian is important both inside and outside the University. For example, before the changes at Harvard [the appointment in 2013 of Sarah Thomas as both Vice President for the Harvard Library and Roy E. Larsen Librarian for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences], it was always confusing to know who to speak with and work with there. Representing the institution as a whole would be a problem without a University Librarian. Additionally, inside the University, faculty and students want a seamless user experience without confusing policy differences and barriers; within the University, the libraries can come together for single [experience].”

[In our decentralized system] “I’m seen as the spokesperson for library issues. I have the best access at the top level of the University; I meet with the Provost and with the campus Budget Committee and the School-based library directors meet with their Deans. We distinguish between which initiatives benefit all of us, which are School-specific.”

[A University Librarian] “…needs to be with, constantly work with colleagues; plugged in at the level of a Dean. The librarian should report to the Provost since the library represents a major chunk of the academic work of the University. Institutions that place a high value on library and research services make this position a Dean, reporting to the Provost. The library’s needs and opportunities get understood and discussed at these levels”.

“My most important colleagues on this campus are other senior leaders; VP Research, Deans of the Colleges and Grad Schools, Dean of Online Education; also the CIO is an important contact. These are the key players; these are the people who make decisions and help strategize about the future. They play an important role, know about what’s happening and what’s on the horizon. For me to understand the mood and direction of the campus is to be part of this group. It’s in part about structure, both informal and formal. Some of most important conversations happen to the side. I am very well positioned by being part of very important decisions and conversations.”

“Informal relationships are very important. I know most of the members of the Board of Trustees from attending many University events as part of the senior leadership. Recently, a request came from a couple of trustees that they hear from the libraries. We gave our first ever presentation to the full Board of Trustees. It was really successful; it gave me an opportunity to show what libraries, and our library in particular, really are these days.”
“My being here as University Librarian is not the most central issue, if you have people who are knowledgeable and can hold people and things together. It’s hard for a group to hold things together but it can be done. In general, though, it is a good thing for someone to be responsible and make a consistent approach to decisions.”

**Insights on Funding Models**

“Students and lot faculty could care less where the funding comes from; they want us to make it as seamless as possible for them. [In our centralized system] we have collection funding from four different schools but we work really carefully across the libraries to support each area. Today needs cut across the different disciplines; a lot things acquired through school funding simultaneously support disciplines in the Arts & Sciences, for example. Everything is negotiated centrally and we are able to leverage between these funding streams. At times A & S (as the largest) budget extends itself to close the deal. And we do not charge back to the individual schools; believe it all washes out eventually. We have one voice for the University Libraries with publishers or vendors or consortia, etc.”

“One challenge [regarding separate funding sources] is that if one school has budget difficulties and, for example, they’re proposing a lower compensation pool or another school is doing really well and would like to give more, but we have an unwritten practice that compensation within the libraries is systemic-wide; we all have to comply or it would be inequitable among staff in the libraries. That’s the only time that there seems to be tension, but the administrators of the schools understand.”

[On our campus where libraries are decentralized] “...the separate libraries are getting smaller [from staff, budget and space cuts]; it’s harder for them to address educational efforts, facility needs, technology. If coordinated at a higher level we could piece together parts of budgets.”

[In our decentralized system, the main library] “...is listed in the University campaign goals, and we are allowed to keep funds we raise. The school libraries, however, may or may not be part of the school’s campaign goals.”

**Insights on Library Information Technology**

“The (main) library has 5 IT units. I think of the library as a major technology center on campus.”

“We are an information organization that is enabled by a central IT infrastructure.”

[Formerly when working with University IT] “Initially IT approached the Library as if talking to a client. But the relationship has changed; ‘I’m not your client, I’m your partner. How do we manager our resources, expertise, etc. to better manage everything out there? How do we enable advanced data mining, visualization, curation capabilities for faculty & students? How do we look at research workflows? What do we do about University records that have archival value? What about large datasets, academic support services for creation and innovation?’ The higher you go up into the research process, the less technology centered it is, the more it’s about working with faculty and students to enable them to do things and more about policy.”
“The expertise of the library is on uses and users; there’s going to be some overlap and partnership with Academic Computing and Instructional Design. I recommend a partial merger – pull the Academic Computing into the Library; don’t have a Library – IT divide but an Academic – Administrative Computing divide. Focus on users, what they’re trying to do, how to make that easier.”

“I meet with the CIO once/month; over years we’ve developed a good understanding of each of our areas and strengths, etc. There was a tendency in the past from the CIO to want to centralize and standardize. But, in a number of cases where we didn’t want to wait for them to develop whatever, if we’ve needed something sooner, we go in that direction. It’s taken some work but we’re at a good point now of respecting differences. The CIO has seen how successful the libraries are and are happy for us. We partner and share costs on some projects, sometimes with the President and/or the Provost. But I wouldn’t say that the CIO is part of all of our conversations about the future of Scholarly Communication; more the nuts and bolts, the underpinnings, rather than the academic side.”

“We depend on central IT; it’s in the central complex of the library and we’re in each others business all the time.”

“The library needs a solid technology team separate from central IT; if it is not separate then the library does not get to move forward in the way that it should. Technology within the library needs to be present and strong.”

**Insights on External Collaborations**

“Most of the successful collaborations that we’ve engaged in have come about through interpersonal contacts, talking at conferences, etc. having an idea and hearing that someone else has that idea. I can’t overestimate the importance of the interpersonal collegial connections. Sometimes too you get the sense of a place by knowing who the leader is and what they’ve done; having someone who’s identified as having the vision and knowing what direction they want to go in. For example, I met another University Librarian at a meeting and we both had the same interest in [X] and it lead to a joint grant for planning and implementing a collaborative project.”

“I need to meet with peers who can make commitments, put their resources where their mouth is, things can get done. There can be a reflection of understanding how libraries are different from other parts of the institution. I want a strong leader. The collaboration is hard enough.”

“Absent one central person [with authority to commit and spend resources], there would be a lot of administrative and budgetary work to get things to happen. It would be almost impossible to do it when turf is highly protected by individual schools and Deans and funds are too, unless you have broad minded thinking folks who understand the interdisciplinary nature of research.”

“Increasingly as we look to libraries [beyond our own campuses] for coordination and consolidation of things that are costly and redundant, we need easy contact points. Unless you have a very well defined set of criteria for collaborative projects which can’t be violated you really run the risk of having a dean of a college say ‘I’m going to cut $x of support, make choices that are based on short-term priorities or financial realities, perhaps ill-informed or narrowly beneficial. It’s very difficult to explore new endeavors—especially beyond scope of campus— when turf is protected by the schools.”
Appendix E: Qualitative Analysis Summary

DJA Consulting conducted a high-level qualitative analysis – discerning and interpreting meaningful patterns or themes – to develop an interpretive picture of the current state of affairs with a strong focus on the future for Tufts University libraries from an informed outside perspective. The SWOT analysis drew upon many sources of information gathered from campus discussions and other input. The peer benchmarking provided a background against which to consider Tufts strengths and weaknesses and, in particular, to highlight opportunities. The analysis examined the libraries while acknowledging that the libraries are part of a wider University environment and a University-wide responsibility.

Strengths
- Providing excellent curricular services
- Building strong relationships within the respective schools
- Developing core collections
- Reimagining library space
- Initiating information management programs
- Exemplifying Tufts’ collaborative culture
- Joining inter-institutional collaborations
- Engaging in a cross-unit structure
- Attempting to maximize resources

Opportunities
- Lead with vision and intention, aligned with the University
- Consider a different organizational structure for the libraries
- Design and deliver new services that assist faculty, as well as students, in their academic success
- Advance initiatives that align with changes in scholarly communication
- Enable academic applications of new media
- Transform library spaces
- Adapt library staffing and expertise to new priorities and needs for the libraries overall
- “Rightscale” resources and intentionally increase support

Weaknesses
- Missing a University-wide strategic planning and action agenda for the libraries overall
- Lacking a designated University-wide leader to represent Tufts’ libraries and to guide overall libraries’ decision-making
- Inadequately developing and scaling programs and services that aid Tufts’ research agenda
- Making insufficient progress in leveraging Tufts’ unique resources and intellectual assets
- Maintaining an overly conservative approach to legacy (print) collections
- Not matching library spaces to emerging needs
- Failing to develop and integrate robust academic information management technologies
- Over-relying on standing committees for shared decision-making
- Using some inefficient financial processes and affected by different funding priorities

Threats
- University already coping with change and tensions
- (University community may not be sufficiently)
- Understanding the dramatic changes taking place in information management and in research libraries
- Experiencing potentially unfavorable consequences of divergence from the research library community
- Withstanding financial uncertainty
Appendix F: Resources for Future Reference

Significant Works about Contemporary Research Libraries


“Academic libraries are faced with a daunting series of challenges brought on by the digital revolution. In an era when millions of books, articles, images, and videos available instantaneously via the web, libraries across all institutional types are experiencing declining demand for their traditional services, built around the storage and dissemination of physical resources.

At the same time, new demand for digital information services and collaborative learning spaces promise new areas of opportunity and engagement with patrons. A rapid and orderly transition to “the library of the future” requires difficult trade-offs, however, as no institution can afford to continue expanding both its commitment to comprehensive, local print collections as well as new investments in staff, technology, and renovations.

This report illustrates how progressive academic libraries are evolving in response to these challenges, providing case studies and best practices in managing library space, staff, and resources.”


“...the recognized shift in libraries’ roles that is occurring between now and 2033:

Research libraries are intimately engaged in and support the full life cycle of knowledge discovery, use, preservation, and sharing in diverse contexts of the university’s mission.

Within two decades, the research library will have transitioned its focus from its role as a knowledge service provider within a single university to become a collaborative partner within the broader ecosystem of higher education.”

ARL has identified five initiatives as a focus for the near future; these provide a vision for research library trends and priorities:

1. Collective Collections – deep and wide platforms for ensuring knowledge resources are available
2. Scholarly Dissemination Engine – promoting wide reaching and sustainable publication of research and scholarship
3. Libraries that Learn – integrated analytical environments to mine data for transformation
4. ARL Academy – fostering and nurturing creative, effective, and diverse research library leaders and leadership
5. Innovation Lab – an incubator for new ideas and the seeds of change.
(Association of College and Research Libraries. Research Planning and Review Committee)
http://crln.acrl.org/content/75/6/294.full.pdf+html

“A unifying theme for current trends [is] deeper collaboration ... on the following in higher education: data, device neutral digital services, evolving openness in higher education, student success initiatives, competency-based learning, altmetrics, and digital humanities.”

Three Challenges: Engaging, Rightscaling and Innovating
(Lorcan Dempsey, Vice President and Chief Strategist, OCLC, Weblog)
http://orweblog.oclc.org/archives/002213.html

“By engagement, I mean that libraries are working to create distinctive value in the research, learning and teaching workflows of their users in ways which go beyond the provision of collections. ...

Libraries were predominantly 'institution-scale' - they provided services at the level of the institution for their local users. However, their users now look to the network for information services (e.g. Google Scholar, Wikipedia, ...). And libraries now look to the network to collaborate or to source services (e.g. HathiTrust, cloud-based discovery or management systems, shared systems infrastructure, ...). At the same time, we are seeing a growing interest in shared management of the collective print collection, as regional and other consortia emerge to rebalance print management across groups of libraries. In this environment the need for local infrastructure declines (e.g. extensive print collections, redundantly deployed local systems which provide necessary but not distinctive services). The scale advantage of different ways of doing things manifests itself in both impact and efficiency. ... As libraries want to emphasize impact and engagement, and de-emphasize activities which do not create distinctive local value, rightscaling becomes a key question.

As behaviors and structures shift, innovation becomes central. ... I think of two big trends here. The first is a shift - well underway - from thinking about the library as a fixed set of services (bureaucratic) to thinking about it as an organization which reconfigures to map changes in its user environment and expectations (enterprise). The second shift is around institutional innovation and the learning that flows from it. ... Institutional innovation is the second trend I note here, one which is inevitable as internal and external partnerships rebalance effort. Libraries have to develop new and routine ways of collaborating to achieve their goals, which involves evolution of organizational, cultural and communication approaches. At the same time they have to negotiate internal boundaries and forge new structures within institutions.”

(Peter Hernon, formerly Professor, Simmons College Graduate School of Library and Information Science, et.al.)
“Directors of academic libraries must be campus leaders, engaged in planning with university administrators, heavily involved in fundraising...[and more].”

“The director is now externally focused. He or she is active on and beyond campus, interacting broadly with the university community, donors, and stakeholders on a wide variety of issues. He or she also is visionary and articulate, representing the library and the university. Clearly, this individual must be a manager and a leader, but not someone deeply involved in the day-to-day operations of the library and isolated or spending much of his or her time internally in the library.”

**People Resources**

Tufts could consider contacting these individuals for additional information on specific elements of research libraries’ organizational and funding models.

Deborah Jakubs, Rita DiGiallonardo Holloway University Librarian & Vice Provost for Library Affairs, Duke University
Current President, Association of Research Libraries
Perspective on decentralized library system
deborah.jakubs@duke.edu
919-660-5800

Anne Kenney, Carl A. Kroch University Librarian, Cornell University
Perspective on transition from decentralized to centralized library system, using memoranda of agreement
ark3@cornell.edu
607-255-3393

Katie McGrath, Director of Administration and Finance, Harvard Library
Perspective on transition from decentralized to partially centralized library system, using financial allocation models
katiemcgrath@fas.harvard.edu
617-496-2079