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I. Executive Summary

The Role of the Librarian Self-Study Team was one of two teams created as part of the Re-envisioning Library Services Initiative. All Library employees, spanning a wide array of classifications and job families, are essential to sustain and develop excellence within UC Berkeley’s Library. As librarianship continues to evolve and respond to the continuous change inherent in the profession, this self-study provided the opportunity to examine the current roles of Berkeley librarians and to clarify what knowledge, skills, and abilities will best serve the Library in the coming years, with emphasis on those that add value to and support for the University’s mission.

The charge to the Role of the Librarian Team was to:

1. Inventory current and potentially new responsibilities for librarians at the UC Berkeley Library
2. Investigate and document approaches for providing each responsibility in new or reduced ways
3. Recommend staffing alignments for scenarios of a librarian workforce at varying levels

Three librarian staffing levels were subsequently defined as:

a) 64 librarians – the current number of librarians within the scope of the review (Library-funded librarians in Doe/Moffitt Libraries, Subject Specialty Libraries, Collections Services, the Bancroft Library, and the East Asian Library);
b) 50 librarians – a further reduction should additional budget cuts be assigned to the Library; and
c) 70 librarians – an enhancement should additional funding resources be identified.

Roles for UC Berkeley Librarians

Librarians fill a fundamental role in educational institutions by providing and preserving critical current and historical information resources, enabling individuals and groups to be self-sufficient researchers, developing the habits for critical thinking and lifelong learning, and supporting diverse intellectual communities through services and spaces available in-person and online. Informed by our professional values, librarians offer an important perspective for the development of policies, standards, and practices related to critical issues such as online education, open access, copyright and fair use, mass digitization, data curation, digital preservation, metadata, and undergraduate student learning. The ability to approach these issues with intellectual dexterity – a sensitivity to disciplinary differences and the commonalities between disciplines, as well as an adroitness for working well with novice and expert researchers alike – is what makes the librarian’s perspective indispensable to the academic mission of the University.

The team identified broad functions performed by librarians at Berkeley: selection, acquisitions, cataloging, archiving, reference, instruction, liaison, outreach, management (unit/department), administration (Associate University Librarian level), and professional responsibilities. For each functional area, core responsibilities were identified and documented. This provided a starting point for conversations with librarians and library staff about realigning priorities and practices across the Library. These conversations focused on determining where the Library should invest more effort, reduce current effort, and implement new methods. The team also identified broad skills and important new roles currently unaddressed in our organization.

Since many research libraries are undertaking similar reviews, the team researched the literature and case studies from peer institutions, and considered how best to align our librarian workforce with the University’s and Library’s mission statements. The team explored possible approaches for addressing current and potentially new responsibilities within the context of the three librarian staffing scenarios. Over the past four years, as the Library has met budget cuts through attrition, gaps in expertise arose in unpredictable ways. Rather than perpetuate these gaps by simply planning for across-the-board cuts to current staffing allocations, the team favored a strategic identification of priorities upon which to base future staffing allocations.

1Re-envisioning Library Services, http://library.berkeley.edu/AboutLibrary/re_envision.html
The following recommended approaches are based on our current assessments:

- Librarians are most valued by the campus community for their subject expertise as manifested in collection building, reference, and instructional services
- Librarians benefit from working as part of a team of professionals serving similar interests
- The Library can improve patron services by implementing more rational and efficient delivery of services
- The knowledge that academic disciplines require varying mixes of electronic and print resources as well as reference and instructional support.

Recommended Approaches

Allowing for some variations between disciplines and for certain specializations, the recommended approaches suggest the Library should:

a) Combine the selector, liaison, and instruction roles for each subject area, and create as many of these positions as possible. These roles are viewed as the highest priority. There is a preference for keeping these functions combined and covering a broader range of subjects if needed.

b) Reduce the number of librarian-manager positions and give them responsibility for a broader span of subjects and/or library units/departments. These librarians would not be expected to serve as the primary selector/liaison/instruction librarian for academic departments, though it is envisioned they will participate in these types of activities as needed.

c) Reduce librarian time spent on front-line reference desk services, focusing instead on more specialized, discipline-specific research consultations. A small number of librarians will expand their role as coordinators to ensure service excellence and continuous improvements for reference in its various forms. This change reflects the national and local trend of users interfacing with librarians in a greater variety of mediums (e.g. chat, email, appointments) and less often at reference desks.

d) Maintain a small instruction unit to provide expertise to the Library and campus, to teach general research instruction, and to support the subject-based librarians teaching subject-based courses for undergraduate and graduate students. Subject-specific instruction for undergraduate and graduate courses is a high priority.

e) Create a sustainable “behind the scenes” environment with fewer catalog, acquisition, and archival librarians. Expand the coordinator roles of these positions to focus on implementation of local and national standards and overseeing quality control for work completed by library staff and external partners.

f) Dedicate an average of 10% of all librarians’ time to provide leadership within the Library and the profession for critical emerging issues.

Analysis of Impact

With known budget reductions of $900,000 still required to reach a sustainable budget, the scenario of 64 librarian FTE may be difficult to maintain. While some portion of that budget reduction will come from the librarian workforce, maintaining a maximum number of librarians was considered critical. The team favored a greater reduction in the number of service points in addition to operational changes to create increased efficiencies. As such, even the 64 librarian FTE scenario would not allow the Library to sustain the expertise across disciplines and programs as we have in the past.

If the librarian FTE drops below the dire current state – the assumption made in the 50 librarian FTE scenario – the Library would not be able to support all disciplines, languages, and initiatives at the current levels. The Library would have to re-evaluate its participation in national and international research collaborations and partnerships. Within a relatively short time, the erosion of collections funding and operations funding will result in Berkeley
moving rapidly down the rankings of the Association of Research Libraries. Since 2004 UC Berkeley Library's ranking has steadily declined from 3rd in the nation to 5th (2005-2007), 6th (2008/09) and most recently 7th (2009/10). As a result, the campus' ability to provide a quality UC education for undergraduates and graduate students and a vital research environment for faculty and researchers would be seriously compromised.

If the Library had the good fortune to increase the librarian workforce above our current levels, the team recommends that the Library continue to emphasize the priorities articulated in this document while ensuring that the core processes and functions are able to work effectively as a whole.

Implementation and Transition

Our ultimate goals, as shaped by the self-study process, are:

- to reorganize ourselves and our operations to address changing needs within academia
- to create interesting, adaptable librarian assignments featuring increased access to faculty and students, and an enhanced understanding of the collections and user needs
- to address the complexity of librarian roles inside and outside the University of California so we positively impact our profession
- to increase cooperation among librarians and library staff
- to become a more flexible and resilient organization; and
- to develop an environment that energizes us and inspires others to seek and maintain employment at Berkeley.

Implementation of new service models and librarian roles will have important consequences for how the Library operates. Significant consideration needs to be given to matching people to new or modified positions, as well as to transitioning librarians into new organizational groups. Just as we will take care to minimize service disruption and maximize satisfaction for library users, the Library will take care to create a process that is respectful, supportive, transparent, and fair and provides staff with the resources needed to be successful.

II. Context, Charge, and Process

An important component of designing the Library’s new service model is articulating the enduring, though evolving, role of the librarian. As we consider how to sustain the Library with fewer staff, we must identify the critical functions for research librarians today and for the future, with emphasis on the roles and expertise that add the most value to the University’s mission. As academics and professionals, Berkeley librarians must also have the capacity and flexibility to remain actively engaged in advancing issues of national and international importance related to research, scholarship, and learning.

In the essay “Changing Roles of Academic and Research Libraries” academic leaders convened by the Association of College and Research Libraries describe the imperative for and potential of such a review:

> The changes that are occurring—in technology, in research, teaching and learning—have created a very different context for the missions of academic and research libraries. This evolving context can afford a moment of opportunity if libraries and librarians can respond to change in proactive and visionary ways. There are diverse and unmet needs now arising within the academy—many of which closely align with the traditional self-definitions of academic and research libraries. To the extent that libraries and their leaders can reposition themselves to serve these evolving needs—which pertain in part to the centralized storage, description, and delivery of academic resources, and in part to the organization and support of scholarly communication within and across higher education institutions—libraries will emerge as even more central and vibrant resources for their institutions.3

Librarianship spans a wide variety of specializations and each position demands expertise in a specific subject, language, or other domain area (e.g. instruction, archiving, and preservation). The range of research programs offered by campus has outpaced the Library’s human resources necessitating that the Library take a fresh look at the way we support all disciplines and domain areas. Within the UC System, groups are analyzing “next generation technical services” issues relevant to all ten sister campuses; their recommendations are likely to inform the processes, practices, and staffing at Berkeley. Similarly, as our campus adopts the Operational Excellence guidelines, the Library is wise to consider how librarians (and by extension, other professional staff) can be best utilized as supervisors, managers, and leaders.

As the Library considers how to scale down our organization to operate within a sustainable budget, we must make choices about how to prioritize among our historical strengths and foci while addressing increasing demands from the digital realm. This self-study considers scenarios and implications of stable and reduced librarian staffing levels, and includes recommendations to assist the Library in determining priorities for librarian positions and allocations of their time.

Charge

In January 2012, the University Librarian charged the Role of the Librarian team to:

1. Inventory current and potentially new responsibilities for librarians at the UC Berkeley Library (e.g. original cataloging/archiving, selection, liaison/outreach, reference, instruction, management/supervision)
2. For each of these responsibilities, investigate and document approaches for providing them in new or reduced ways (including potential benefits and drawbacks when possible)
3. Recommend how responsibilities should be assigned in scenarios with a librarian workforce to match three scenarios (numbers forthcoming).

---

  http://www.ala.org/acrl/issues/value/changingroles
The charge concludes: “It is important to understand that the work of this team is not a theoretical exercise, but will have consequences for how the library operates. For example, if it is found that all the current librarian responsibilities must be retained at their currently reduced levels, it is reasonable to conclude that these would have to be applied over fewer service points and broader subject areas to be sustainable. I also call your attention to The NextGen LAUC Member: A Report from the LAUC Committee on Professional Governance as an important resource.”

Process

The Role of the Librarian team met weekly from January 26, 2012 to April 12, 2012.

To guide our thinking the team sought input from all library staff on three occasions. On February 21, the University Librarian and team co-chairs hosted an “early bird” for library colleagues to hear about the re-envisioning initiative and general plans for each team, and to ask questions. On February 28, the team shared the “List of Librarian Functions” with library staff, calling for additions and revisions. On March 5, the team hosted an open meeting about “re-envisioning library roles” to explore priorities and practices of key functions and to consider possible staffing approaches overall.

The team discussions covered five primary topics:

- Mission of the University and the Library’s current and potential role
- Value that the Library, and librarians specifically, add to the research and educational enterprise
- Identification and assessment of existing roles and functions of Berkeley librarians
- Recommendations about prioritization of critical roles for librarians to advance the Library and the University in relation to Library Service Model team’s report
- Recommendations about process for creating equitable assignments and transitioning librarians

4 Self-study Team Charges Re-envisioning the Library Initiative, http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/AboutLibrary/re_envision_charges.html
5 FAQ, Re-envisioning the Library Initiative. http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/UCOnly/re_envision_staff.html
III. Assessment of Library’s Contribution to Campus Goals

In order to check and challenge our assumptions about the most valuable current and future roles of libraries, and by extension of librarians, the team mined various sources for insight and context. With the short timeline for this self-study, the team drew upon campus documents, reports from peer institutions, research studies, and national reports to intuit the changing role of libraries and librarianship and consider the applicability to the Berkeley environment.

Mission

The Role of the Librarian team’s efforts were grounded in the University of California’s ongoing mission to educate students at all levels to help create an educated workforce; to do research to expand fundamental knowledge of human nature, society, and the natural world; and to provide public service by disseminating research results and translating scientific discoveries into practical knowledge.

The Library's role in this enterprise continues to be guided by our Statement of Purpose which states that, “the UC Berkeley Library connects students and scholars to the world of information and ideas. With a daily commitment to excellence and innovation, we select and create, organize and protect, provide and teach access to resources that are relevant to our campus programs and pursuits.”

From these guiding documents, it is our belief that librarians are most valued for our subject expertise and our ability to bring hard-to-identify resources to individual and collaborative research endeavors; our systems for acquiring, organizing, preserving, and disseminating this information have proven, and continue to prove, invaluable to the University’s educational, research, and service mission. In an increasingly interdisciplinary research environment, librarians are well positioned to facilitate linkages within and across academic disciplines and to aid in the dissemination and ingestion of information and data.

Literature Review and Case Studies

A review of the professional literature, case studies, and research about faculty and student needs (Appendix A and B) surfaced the following trends that the team kept in mind while evaluating different approaches and roles for librarians.

- University education is increasingly organized “ecologically” where disciplines are integrative and interactive.
- Pedagogy has shifted to include more active and self-directed learning in an increasingly collaborative environment.
- Faculty, graduate students, and other researchers are not as aware as they should be about the resources we currently provide.
- An increasing number of institutions are establishing mechanisms to track resources that users seek but that the library does not own.
- While the speed at which researchers move from print to electronic resources varies by academic discipline (e.g. humanities faculty seem to prefer browsable collections, while science faculty seem to prefer e-resources), comprehensive collections continue to be highly valued by students and faculty alike.
- At many institutions there is an increasing need for librarians to focus on support of the scholarship process (teaching and research) in addition to or in place of scholarship products (collections).
- The literature notes that academic libraries are increasingly used for quiet study and collaborative work, and they often lack sufficient space for these activities.
- Undergraduates indicate that a world-class library collection is one of the top reasons they choose to attend Berkeley, but that they require enhanced instruction in order to take advantage of these collections and to better understand the library resources available to them.
- Undergraduates also want better access to online resources, the ability to borrow digital devices, and enhanced services that support research from off-campus.
- In an era of constrained resources it is critical that the Library regularly collect meaningful qualitative and quantitative data to provide evidence of the Library’s centrality to the University’s mission.
• Undergraduates want 24x7 access to the collections, just-in-time reference assistance, and collaborative physical spaces. They view the academic atmosphere of the library as irreplaceable for intensive individual study as well.
• It is critical to have regular mechanisms for getting campus feedback which we can use to ensure sustained excellence through continuous innovations and improvements.
• There is a growing expectation that academic libraries will be involved in new areas such as data curation, copyright and intellectual property consultations, and scholarly communications.
• The rise of virtual scholarly spaces and cloud computing have increased the expectation that librarians participate in these environments and be prepared to help researchers navigate them.
• When ownership of content is not possible, researchers value access which is made possible through partnerships with other institutions; as such, there is increasing demand for fully integrated, standardized cross-institutional search systems that facilitate the discovery of both print and electronic resources.

Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats

Our SWOT analysis (Appendix C) revealed strengths in the subject expertise, motivation, and talent of UC Berkeley’s librarian and non-librarian staff as well as in the depth and breadth of our print and electronic collections. These are areas for which the Library is internationally known. Our faculty, student, and community patrons are diverse and loyal to the Library as evidenced by recent student demands for increased library service and strong research and instructional ties with the faculty. Our leadership role within the UC System is also viewed as a unique strength.

The team identified a number of weaknesses including a complex, fragmented, and somewhat inflexible organizational structure as well as a lack of regular data about our operations, services, and impact. Our reduced level of staffing, the need for additional staff training, constrained financial resources, and uncompetitive salaries are additional weaknesses that impede our ability to serve Berkeley's students, faculty, and staff.

Threats include possible additional losses of funding, increased mandates from CDC/UCOP, and loss of institutional knowledge and subject expertise due to librarian attrition. Any of these threats would be serious – but loss of staff and their skills is the biggest threat. Without strategic replacements, the Library will be unable to effectively meet our core constituents' needs in an ever more complex information landscape. If we fall too far behind, it will affect our ability to provide value to the overall mission of the University.

A number of opportunities also exist,
• We have the potential to enhance our national leadership role in digital acquisition and curation (through expanded efforts in HathiTrust and increased digitization of archival and other print materials).
• As part of the 10-campus UC System there is great potential for additional collaborations and leveraged synergies.
• We are also well positioned to partner with faculty in the expansion of online education by bringing our experience with learning management systems, pedagogy in online environments, open educational materials projects, and application of fair use principles.
• We have the potential to pursue new funding and revenue sources through partnerships, grants, and focused fundraising initiatives.
• Despite the loss of staff, the Library has the opportunity to increase patron satisfaction through improved marketing of our existing and new services, and
• Most importantly, prioritized and consolidated library services offer the opportunity for a more cohesive, subject-focused, and intelligibly-organized user experience.
IV. Assessment of Librarians’ Roles

Libraries fill a fundamental role in educational institutions by providing and preserving critical current and historical information resources, enabling individuals and groups to be self-sufficient researchers, developing the habits of mind for critical thinking and lifelong learning, and supporting diverse intellectual communities through services and spaces available in-person and online. The core values which guide our professional practice include equitable access to information for all library users, preservation of information in all formats, protection of user privacy and confidentiality, support for free expression and intellectual freedom, and cultivation of an informed citizenry.6

Informed by these professional values and the role of libraries in society and in academia, librarians offer an important perspective for the development of policies, standards, and practices related to critical issues such as online education, open access, copyright and fair use, mass digitization, data curation, digital preservation, metadata, and undergraduate student learning. To fill these needs, librarian positions require subject, language, and/or other domain area expertise in addition to professional values, technical skills, and pedagogical abilities. The ability to approach these issues with intellectual dexterity -- a sensitivity to disciplinary differences and the commonalities between disciplines, as well as an adroitness for working well with novice and expert researchers alike -- makes the librarian’s perspective indispensible.

To support the campus’ research and teaching needs, the Library has identified “library liaisons” for each campus department, school, and college. Liaisons are usually librarians with subject and/or language expertise who provide research and reference consultations, instruction to courses and research groups, and communication about library collections and services. Frequently the liaison also is a “selector” responsible for identifying, acquiring, and managing print and electronic materials to build the library collections in that field. Individual librarian assignments have organically evolved as colleagues have retired and assignments have shifted to others. In reviewing these positions, the Library seeks to ensure a more equitable balance among individuals, and to develop shared priorities and effective practices among colleagues working within and across disciplines.

To address core programmatic directives, the Library has identified some librarians with domain expertise in areas such as acquisitions, licensing, preservation, cataloging, archives, and instruction – all of which are hallmarks of the traditional library. Each of these areas is coping with a host of challenges related to the rise of new technologies, digital content, and user behavior in online environments. At the same time the Library has identified emerging issues for which there is no one formally assigned or not to the degree demanded:

- social media and digital interactivity
- web services, discovery tools, and virtual presence
- online education (including pedagogical and delivery issues)
- e-research (including data management, training, all disciplines)
- digital assets (including data curation, asset management, preservation strategies, and promotion of open access)
- digital humanities
- first-year experience (including recruitment and making connections with freshman and new transfer students)
- user experience and assessment
- Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
- mass digitization and access (including HathiTrust, Google Books, new opportunities)
- disabilities services (including web accessibility, service expectations, new models with e-resources)
- copyright and fair use (including training for library staff and faculty, e-reserves, streamed media, etc)

• metadata (including schemas for digitized and born-digital content)

As the team considers the future role for Berkeley librarians, one priority is to ensure our continued participation in national projects with wide-scale impact as well as local expertise to keep our Library and campus on the leading edge.

Understanding the Berkeley Environment

The Berkeley Library is a large, complex organization. To better understand the current environment and acknowledge the range of responsibilities and roles, the team drew together a “List of Librarian Functions” [Appendix D]

**Cataloging/Archiving:**
Responsible for the bibliographic content within the Library’s catalog as well as the accuracy and reliability of that content; collaborates with UC libraries and on a national level to establish cataloging standards and best practices; creates metadata in MARC and non-MARC schemas in all languages for all formats. Cataloging/Archiving work supports functions such as reference, instruction, circulation, and collection development. It also directly contributes to the discovery and access of the material purchased, licensed, and endowed to the Library by faculty, students, and staff, as well as to other UC, national, and international libraries.

**Selection/Acquisition:**
Responsible for shaping and managing the entire lifecycle of a complex array of research materials in support of the University’s teaching and research missions; develops and implements collection development policies; performs selection for a wide range of materials (including traditional print collections, data sets, visual materials, manuscripts and archives, electronic resources, other materials in special format, etc.); works collaboratively with other UC libraries and external organizations concerning collection issues; consults with faculty concerning resources; anticipates scholarly and teaching needs by documenting new intellectual and social trends and by being apprised of new technologies; works with vendors, publishers and donors who produce, collect and supply resources; and manages funds and advocates for new funding.

**Liaison Role:**
The library liaison facilitates communication about library resources, services, collections, initiatives, and expertise across library constituents to ensure that the Library is effectively supporting the research, teaching, learning, and other needs of our community. Liaison responsibilities focus on personalized interaction-assistance and accessibility. Activities include: promotion of library services, collections, and resources; intensive and personalized consultations; community engagement and enhanced library visibility; user needs assessment; engagement with and advocacy for emerging academic and research paradigms; collaboration with our patrons on special projects; internal facilitation and collaboration; and facilitation of external partnerships. [Appendix E]

**Reference/Instruction:**
Responsible for providing in-person and virtual reference services to faculty, students, staff, and public patrons using the medium most appropriate for efficiently connecting patrons to the resources they need. Also responsible for providing instruction at various levels (introductory, advanced, and individual) about library resources and policies, course specific research methodologies, and the scholarly process including issues such as fair use, open access, and data management.

**Unit/Department Management:**
Responsible for setting unit priorities in support of the University’s teaching and research missions and participating in library-wide strategic planning; and leads and supports the unit staff in developing and implementing innovative and effective services that are responsive to and anticipate user needs. Unit/Departmental Management also plans, analyzes, prioritizes, and manages resources for effective and
efficient operation of the unit; directs the development and maintenance of the library facilities, collections, and/or services; and establishes and maintains strong relations with library and campus colleagues.

Administration:
Responsible for enhancing the vision of the Library as an exemplar of research, scholarship, learning, teaching, and collaboration; establishes a clear direction for the future of the Library as an integrated system; directs operations of one or more Library divisions; effects positive change in a large, complex academic library; serves as a fair, progressive leader to the Library's staff; garners and leverages resources for maximum impact; creates and communicates Library policies that support the above activities; represents the Library on campus, within the UC System, and beyond; and advocates for the Library, library staff, library values, and the present and future roles of academic libraries.

Professional Responsibilities:
The University Library benefits from having a professional staff that is engaged with current issues in librarianship, aware of trends and best practices in the profession, and in touch with library leaders around the country and world. Towards that end, both the University's Academic Personnel Manual [APM 360 - Appendix A. Professional Academic Issues] and the union's Memorandum of Understanding [MOU Article 3.A. Professional Activities and Development] encourage and require professional development activities.

With a smaller library workforce due to reduced library budgets, the Library must make wise choices about which responsibilities should be handled by librarians in order to maximize the use of their expertise to advance the University, the Library, and the profession.
V. Approaches and Priorities

Informed by the approaches employed by peer institutions and an analysis of the specific opportunities for Berkeley, the team produced overviews for each of the primary roles of librarians. The overviews included potential approaches for addressing core responsibilities in different ways to take into account the potential for a reduced librarian workforce. [Appendix F]

At an open meeting, library staff provided valuable feedback to inform the priorities and processes for each of these roles [Appendix G]. This process affirmed Berkeley’s historic and continued commitment to building rich collections to support the depth and breadth of research conducted by the wide range of departments and programs of our campus. To ensure that novice and experienced researchers and scholars – from first-year undergraduates to emeritus faculty – can make effective and efficient use of these information tools and resources, the librarians’ connection to instructors, faculty, departments, programs, and research groups is critical. The instructional role of librarians for traditional in-person courses as well as new online degrees has become prominent. The traditional role of catalogers, who make our collections discoverable and accessible, remains a significant focus for the Library. This involves handling the quantity and diversity of languages, formats, and materials received and demands new strategies for tapping needed expertise. Perhaps the single largest transformation required is a new view of the organizational structure and interrelationships between librarians, breaking down traditional silos of stand-alone libraries; librarian-manager positions are re-envisioned to focus on broader spans of subjects and bring together teams of librarians and library staff in more functional and supportive communities.

Recommended Approaches

a) Combine the selector, liaison, and instruction roles for each subject area, and create as many of these positions as possible. These roles are viewed as the highest priority. There is a preference for keeping these roles combined and covering a broader range of subjects if necessary. While many librarians already fill these three roles, there are a number of selectors with limited liaison or instructional responsibilities, and some liaisons without selection authority. Established practices and procedures already exist to support these combined roles and the benefits of increased integration include the ability to fill subject gaps due to librarian attrition, more equitable assignment of subject responsibilities, increased responsiveness to patron and departmental collection needs, and greater support for combined selector/liaison/instructor roles within disciplinary clusters. In most cases the combined selector/liaison/instructor role will be paired with specialized reference responsibilities for the subject area being covered.

b) Reduce the number of librarian-manager positions and give them responsibility for a broader span of subjects and/or library locations. These librarians would not be expected to serve as the primary selector/liaison/instruction librarian for departments, though it is envisioned they will participate in these activities as needed. The Library currently has 28 librarians providing unit management in addition to other responsibilities; in smaller units and subject specialty libraries these librarians may oversee as few as one or two employees. In addition to duplication of effort, managerial responsibilities diminish these librarians’ ability to provide patron services and lead to varying policies, hours of operation, and the types and levels of services offered. Our preferred approach is to reduce the number of librarians responsible for management by clustering services (primarily along subject-related affinities) and by having a single librarian-manager overseeing a broader span of subjects and/or locations. It was strongly felt that while additional operational responsibilities could be given to non-librarian staff, the role of consolidated library management should be the responsibility of librarians. The benefits of this approach include enabling librarians to foster enhanced liaison and selection services; increasing the opportunities for cross-training within consolidated libraries; supporting continuity of service in the event of vacations, illnesses, or attrition; and creating consistent services within and between consolidated libraries.

c) Reduce librarian time spent on front-line reference desk services, focusing instead on more specialized, discipline-specific research consultations. A small number of librarians will expand
their role as coordinators to ensure service excellence and continuous improvements for reference. The team felt strongly that librarians must continue their involvement in providing reference services, but that they should focus on specialized, discipline specific consultations. Reference is provided in myriad ways including in-person, chat, email, phone, intensive research consultations, and subject guides. Questions are also highly variable, ranging from directional to highly specialized consultations with faculty and doctoral students. Exclusive use of online reference (via chat, kiosks, video conferencing) was explored, but rejected as being inefficient and insufficient to answer more advanced questions. Nevertheless, online reference services do need to be advanced to support patrons’ desire for just-in-time reference. Most reference desks already employ a mix of librarian and non-librarian staff, and this should continue. As different academic disciplines require varying levels of reference desk support (science researchers appear to use reference desks less frequently than social sciences and arts and humanities researchers), support for reference desk services may vary by academic discipline. A reduced number of reference desks will also facilitate increased hours at those service points, increased communication between reference providers, and improved continuity of service in the event of illnesses or other absences.

d) Support a small instruction unit to provide expertise to the Library and campus, and supporting the subject-based librarians teaching undergraduate and graduate courses. Subject-specific instruction for undergraduate and graduates courses is a high priority. Instruction is a critical librarian function and is an efficient means to train students to navigate the increasingly complex information landscape. Combining instruction with liaison and selector roles by subject discipline recognizes the specialized resources required by students in various subject disciplines. Providing instruction also helps librarians fulfill liaison and selection responsibilities through interactions with students. A small library-wide instruction unit will still be required to support non-course specific instruction (such as general orientations, summer sessions, and tool-based workshops) and library-wide instructional services such as managing Library a la Carte, library integration with bSpace, liaison roles with the Office of Educational Development and the Center for Teaching and Learning, and campus initiatives related to online learning. The benefits of aligning instruction with subject clusters include a more even distribution of instruction by discipline, increased cross-training within clusters, and the ability to assign instruction sessions within clusters based on individual librarian instructional abilities. Non-librarian staff will continue to provide generalized introductory instruction within subject affinities.

e) Create a sustainable “behind the scenes” environment with fewer catalog, acquisition, and archival librarians. Expand the coordinator roles of these positions to focus on implementation of local and national standards and overseeing quality control for work completed by library staff and external partners. Librarians will continue to play a key coordinating role in acquisitions, cataloging, and the processing of special collections. Librarians are required to interpret national trends and innovations, set local policies related to cataloging, oversee the work of outsourced projects, and represent UC Berkeley in agreements/contracts with vendors and publishers. UC Berkeley Acquisitions and Catalog Departments have already been consolidated due to attrition, but there remain additional opportunities to consolidate managerial positions under a single head for all Library acquisitions and another head of all campus self-cataloging operations. Similarly, all Library units performing aspects of special collections processing could be consolidated under the Bancroft Library. Outsourcing might be achieved through greater reliance on vendors who provide shelf-ready materials and outsourcing of special cataloging projects and the increased use of non-librarian staff to catalog in non-English languages. Increased collaboration within the UC System, potential external partners, and the use of non-librarian staff will allow for the cataloging of materials in languages and formats not currently covered by in-house or outsourced experts.

f) Dedicate approximately 10% of librarians’ time to provide leadership for critical emerging issues. The need to assume increased workloads with a reduced number of librarians has impeded our ability to develop expertise and play a leadership role internally within our Library and/or in wider forums for emerging issues critical to librarianship. Areas include, but are not limited to, promoting open-access scholarship, digital preservation, data curation and management, and copyright and fair use issues. An increased Library-wide leadership role would become an assigned part of a librarian’s primary job. While librarians would retain their ability to choose how to focus their professional activities beyond their primary
job, this approach further supports individual librarian’s career development, results in a more consistent effort than from current “volunteerism”, builds local expertise, and enhances the reputation of the Berkeley Library on a national and international level.
VI. Staffing Alignments with Given Scenarios

The next task was to recommend staffing alignments for three significantly different scenarios of librarian staffing levels. The scope of this project included Doe/Moffitt Libraries, Subject Specialty Libraries, Collections Services (Acquisitions, Cataloging, Licensing and Preservation), Bancroft Library, and East Asian Library. After reviewing the list of all librarians at these libraries, it was clear that some positions should not be considered within this review such as temporary positions, contract positions, and positions with responsibilities dictated by an endowment or other funding source. Our focus was directed toward the 64 FTE (full time equivalent) librarian positions on recurring funding -- funding which affirms the constancy of their appointment while affording flexibility in their specific assignment.

The three future staffing scenarios examined were: 64 librarian FTE as our “steady state” scenario representing our current reality; 50 librarian FTE as the “rock bottom” scenario should there be further funding reductions; and 70 librarian FTE as the “enhanced” scenario should state funding improve or additional funding sources be identified.

Our first step was to analyze the current allocation of librarian effort Library-wide. The process involved first identifying general categories of positions and, within each category determining an estimate of time typically focused on each primary function performed.

The categories of positions included:
- manager of public service unit
- manager of domain area (such as preservation, acquisitions, cataloging, technical services)
- manager of sub-units (librarian-managers who report to other librarian-managers)
- cataloging/archiving/acquisitions only
- reference/instruction only
- selection/ liaison/instruction/reference.

The primary functions mirrored those discussed earlier in this report:
- management
- selection/ liaison
- reference
- instruction
- cataloging/archiving/acquisitions
- leadership.

The percentages of time toward those primary functions were totaled across all categories of librarian positions to estimate the amount of effort we currently put toward those functions Library-wide.

The second step was to revise the categories of positions and the estimated effort toward primary functions based upon envisioned new service models outlined by the Library Service Model Team. Changes included:
- reducing the number of managers and allowing those who do manage to focus an increased amount of time on that function (includes shifting managerial responsibilities from the sub-unit level)
- reducing the amount of front-line reference provided by librarians (reference provided through consultations and referrals is included with the liaison role) and
- defining a portion of librarian time to provide leadership for issues of Library-wide and/or national importance.

The percentages of time toward the primary functions were totaled across all categories of librarian positions to estimate the overall percentage of effort we might anticipate putting toward those functions Library-wide under a new service model. [Appendix H] These overall percentages were then applied to the 64, 70, and 50 FTE scenarios to derive an FTE headcount of effort. The result of this exercise can be seen in the table below titled...
“Librarian Staffing Alignments for Scenarios.” The first column identifies the function, the second shows the allocation of effort for current librarian assignments, and the remaining columns show the team’s recommended allocations for the three scenarios.

**Table 1: Librarian Staffing Alignments for Scenarios**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRIMARY FUNCTIONS</th>
<th>64 Librarians (Current)</th>
<th>64 Librarian Future Scenario</th>
<th>70 Librarian Future Scenario</th>
<th>50 Librarian Future Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE Effort</td>
<td>% FTE</td>
<td>FTE Effort</td>
<td>% FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection/Liaison</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging/Archiving/Acquisitions</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each of the three future staffing scenarios the percentage of effort is constant and calculated as the number of FTE that would contribute to that function in the 64/70/50 scenarios. All of these scenarios assume adoption of the approaches recommended in this document, including:

- new organizational models for teams of librarians collaboratively supporting disciplinary clusters
- a shift of librarian effort toward coordinating and overseeing cataloging/archiving/acquisition standards and methods perhaps performed by temporary staff or other staffing sources
- new approaches for selection
- new service models for reference and instruction.

Depending on the actual number of librarians with responsibilities for selection/liaison/instruction/reference and the balance of their time spent on other primary functions, the number of faculty, graduate students and undergraduate students associated with their role would vary. One goal is to make selection/liaison assignments more equitable across the Library, while accounting for variables such as academic disciplinary differences. It is important to understand that this is simply a model, allowing us to consider our priorities and choices; it is not a directive nor does it show how individual librarian positions would be defined.

**Analysis**

If additional funding was identified and the librarian workforce were to increase – as in the 70 FTE librarian scenario – the team recommended that the Library continue to emphasize the priorities articulated in this document with some nuances. While management was the function identified for low- or no-growth, there was strong interest in ensuring that cataloging/archiving/acquisitions staffing and selection/liaison/instruction/reference staffing were kept in balance with the goal of ensuring that the materials we acquire are discoverable and accessible. It is important to note that without new funding, an increase in the number of librarians would necessitate a reduction of the number of other library staff positions and/or Library service points to operate within a sustainable budget.

In fact, even the steady state scenario of 64 FTE librarian positions may be difficult to maintain. Within the next three years, the Library must cut an additional $900,000 from across all Library operations to reach a sustainable budget in light of the budget reductions known as of January 2012. Any additional budget reductions or unfunded mandates will increase these figures causing further downsizing of the Library workforce. Assuming this anticipated reduction will not come exclusively from other parts of the Library budget, the librarian workforce
would potentially be reduced to 51-58 FTE librarian positions. While some reduction may come from the librarian workforce, maintaining a maximum number of librarians was considered critical for helping the University meet its central mission and providing the greatest benefit to the State of California. Librarians’ unique expertise building, shaping, preserving, and teaching others to effectively use collections serves researchers and scholars; our effectiveness in sustaining these functions today will have a direct and powerful impact on research and scholarship in the future. To maintain the maximum number of librarian positions, the team favored a greater decrease in the number of service points and adoption of operational changes that would increase efficiencies. Although labeled a “steady state scenario”, the 64 FTE librarian scenario no longer allows the Library to sustain the high level of services and expertise across disciplines and programs as we had in the past.

The 50 FTE librarian scenario represents a loss of an additional 14 librarians, or 22% of the current librarian workforce, and is considered to be a disaster scenario. With such a substantial loss of funding and expertise, the team believes that the paradigm completely breaks down and the Library would need to revisit fundamental aspects of our Library operations, services, and staffing. With this level of librarian staffing, Berkeley would no longer be able to acquire or catalog unique and deep collections across the disciplines and languages currently supported. The Library, informed by campus priorities, could identify a select number of programs, formats, issues, or services to support, and would have to re-evaluate its participation in national and international research collaborations and partnerships. Within a relatively short time, the erosion of collections funding and operations funding will result in Berkeley moving rapidly down the rankings of the Association of Research Libraries. The campus’ ability to provide a quality UC education for undergraduates and graduate students and a vital research environment for faculty and researchers would be seriously compromised.
VII. Recommendations for Transitioning Librarian Assignments

Our ultimate goals are to reorganize ourselves and our operations to address changing needs within academia; to create interesting, adaptable librarian assignments featuring increased access to faculty and students, and an enhanced understanding of the collections and user needs; to address the complexity of librarian roles inside and outside the University of California so we positively impact our profession; to increase cooperation among librarians and library staff; to become a more flexible and resilient organization; and to develop a work environment that energizes us and inspires others to seek and maintain employment at Berkeley.

With the two self-study team reports now released, it is clear that we will need to implement significant organizational changes to meet these goals. Implementation of new service models and librarian roles will have important consequences for how the Library operates. Once the scope of individual positions has been determined, the question remains as to how to identify people for these transformed roles such as through internal recruitment, national searches, or a redefinition of an existing librarian’s scope of responsibilities. Significant consideration needs to be given to matching people to new or modified positions, as well as to transitioning librarians into new organizational groups. It is imperative that we support our colleagues as their positions evolve. Just as we will take care to minimize service disruption and maximize satisfaction for library users, the Library should take care to create a process that is respectful, supportive, transparent and fair and provides staff with the resources (such as training, tips, time) needed to be successful.

While the details remain unconfirmed until after the campus comment period concludes and the final “Outcome Letter” is issued, the team anticipated possible steps that may come and offers some advice:

Before the “Outcome Letter” is issued:

- It is essential that Library administration reiterate to all library staff that the organizational structure and people’s individual assignments will change to address the recommended library service models and priorities for librarian roles. Library administration has stated repeatedly that the implementation plans will rely on attrition as library staff retire or leave the Library. Allaying staff fears of layoffs is important and a point that cannot be emphasized too often.

- Librarian reassignments made prior to the plan’s implementation should continue to be designed as interim assignments (e.g. 18 months).

- Library administration is encouraged to develop clear priorities within the implementation plan indicating phases of consolidation and the expertise required to address the new library model.

- As we re-envision, convey that we are “in it together” to change the Library, respond to the new academic environment, and provide the best possible service to our patrons.

Once the implementation plan is known:

- Articulate short-term and long-term goals to facilitate change in small, actionable steps.

- Use metric-based and evidence-based approaches to determine reassignments.

- Apply one-time funding where useful to fill gaps, allowing library staff time for training and adjustments.

- Library administration should provide comprehensive team-based training for new roles.

- External experts may be called on to help facilitate organizational change.
- Library administration should create opportunities for librarians performing similar functions to work collaboratively to identify how to address priorities, the key obstacles to implementation, and ways in which Library administration could respond to those obstacles.

- There are likely to be a reduced number of librarian-manager positions, and the managerial focus of those positions will demand a much greater portion of time, and perhaps a different skill set, to help shift the organization and support staff to move towards the new priorities. It will be important to address librarian-manager assignments first.

- For managerial positions, input should be solicited from the Library employees to be supervised about the candidates under consideration to help ensure effective work teams and organizational compatibility.

- Some internal shifting of assignments may be logical without requiring recruitment. Changes will be needed to ensure a more equitable distribution of overall responsibility, though these are likely to affect only portions of a librarian’s full assignment. For example, subject specialist librarians might assume additional subject areas that complement their current assignments and/or the subjects supported by the library team they work with.

- Where current UC Berkeley librarians already possess the skills or show potential for growth into new positions, it is preferable to reassign or recruit internally rather than conduct national searches. Internal recruitment provides a career development path within the Library, rewards prior performance, and is less expensive than national searches and extensive campus orientation of external hires. The Library may wish to seek staff nominations and self-nominations to ensure that qualified internal candidates are not overlooked.

- In the cases where it is not apparent that existing Library employees have either the skill set, the desire, or the potential for growth into the new position, national searches may need to be conducted, but should also be open to internal candidates.

Careful application of the recommendations for transitioning librarian assignments, coupled with regular opportunities for employee and patron assessment of the implementation, will improve our transition to a new library model.
## VIII. Team Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Dupuis</td>
<td>Co-Chair, Associate University Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Eifler</td>
<td>Co-Chair, Interim Head of the Environmental Design Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Carter</td>
<td>Humanities Selector, Doe/Moffitt Libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gail Ford</td>
<td>Collections Analyst, Collections Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jianye He</td>
<td>Librarian for Chinese Collections, East Asian Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernie Hurley</td>
<td>Director for Library Collections and Library Technologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Jan</td>
<td>Head of the Public Health Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffery Loo</td>
<td>Cheminformatics Librarian, Chemistry Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Robinson</td>
<td>Director of the Institute of Governmental Studies Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Rowlison de Ortiz</td>
<td>Head, Catalog Department, Collections Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilary Schiraldi</td>
<td>Head of the Long Business Library</td>
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IX. Appendix
Appendix A. Selected Readings: Literature Review and Case Studies

General Documents

The section on Personnel and Public Services shows reported figures for numbers of professional staff, support staff, and student staff. These are difficult to interpret since the Berkeley figures include the affiliated libraries, contract employees, temporary staff, and the out-of-scope units. The summary data offers the mean, median, high and low figures for staffing in each of these categories at peer institutions.

The section called Analysis of Selected Variables offers some interesting data about staffing, services, and funding. For example, there is data about the number of professional staff as a percentage of total staff, the number of support staff as a percentage of total staff, and the ratio of professional staff to support staff -- each with mean, median, high and low figures. (ED)


Comparing data from 1991 and 2010, ARL institutions indicate dramatic increases for interlibrary services and instruction, while reference transactions and library FTE have noticeable decreased. (ED)


Abstract: The ACRL/ULS Committee on the Future of University Libraries is charged with exploring and documenting emerging issues, trends, and services in university libraries, and identifying and articulating means through which ULS can support university librarians in the future. In support of this mission, the Committee on the Future of University Libraries initiated a review of recent literature relating to university libraries in order to identify publications and resources that support university librarians in their efforts to plan and prepare for changes in university libraries and higher education broadly. This report outlines the themes that emerged from publications between June 2011 and January 2012, and discusses identified issues and trends centering around three principal elements of university libraries’ futures: missions, money, and people. This report aims to provide university librarians with an appreciation and understanding of current and future leadership and management challenges, and to encourage university librarians to engage in forward-looking discussions of how to best contribute to the effectiveness of universities and university libraries.

Standards combine previous individual standards for College Libraries, Community and Junior College Libraries and University Libraries sections of ACRL and refocus emphasis on demonstrating outcomes and benchmarking institutional effectiveness. Discusses use of outcomes-assessment-based model and evidence-based model to demonstrate “the ways in which library users are changed as a result of their contact with the library’s resources and programs.”

Useful in that performance indicators given for each of 9 principles. Appendix 1 has “sample outcomes” and a very useful Appendix 2 suggests variables to benchmark with peer institutions (e.g. salary and wage expenditures per enrolled student, collection expenditures per enrolled student, process metrics such as cost per hour open, circulation per holdings, volumes per full-time faculty or student, volumes added per year per student, ratio of e-serial titles to print serial titles, etc.) (DE)

**Value of Academic Libraries Report** [Full Report (PDF)] | [Executive Summary (PDF)]
This ACRL publication is a review of the quantitative and qualitative literature, methodologies, and best practices currently in place for correlating performance and demonstrating the value of academic libraries.

Initiative created by ACRL to support librarians in demonstrating the value of academic libraries to university leadership. 182-page report includes review of literature, suggestions for immediate next steps, and proposed research agenda. “Next steps” include: defining library outcomes of institutional relevance and measure their attainment; adoption of assessment management systems of learning outcomes aligned with the university mission; determining what libraries enable students, faculty and staff to do; collecting data on individual library user behavior; increasing library impact on student enrollment, retention and graduation; enhancing library contribution to student job success; tracking library influence on student achievement and learning; documenting student perception of quality; increasing library contribution to faculty research productivity and grant funding; improving library support for faculty teaching; tracking library contributions to overall institutional prestige; engaging in accreditation processes; appointing librarian liaisons to support senior university leadership; creating library assessment plans; promoting librarian professional development; and mobilizing library administrators to support library assessment efforts. Report provides detailed examples in each of the above areas. Suggestions for future research provide detailed research questions suggestions for data collection and analysis. Appendix A is a useful “Academic Library Value Checklist”. (DE)

**Methodologies for Re-envisioning Librarian Roles**

**Blended Librarianship: [Re]Envisioning the Role of Librarian as Educator in the Digital Information Age.**
Shank, John D. and Bell, Steven; Reference & User Services Quarterly; Winter 2011, Vol. 51 Issue 2, p105-110, 6p  [PDF Full Text (118KB)]

Bell and Shank proposed in 2004 that blended librarians combine “the traditional skill set of librarianship with the information technologist’s hardware/software skills, and the instructional or educational designer’s ability to apply technology appropriately in the teaching-learning process.” Blended librarianship is intentionally not library centric (i.e., focused on the building and its physical collections) but, rather, it is librarian centric (i.e., focused on people’s skill, knowledge they have to offer, and relationships they build). Blended librarians should be “educational leaders in digital information age, partners in the evolving academic library.)

The founders of blended librarianship believed that for librarians to remain relevant they must be open to adopting new skills, knowledge, and ideas. It complements several of the emerging ideas about academic libraries and librarians today. Blended librarianship is essential to creating the partnerships and collaboration necessary to
develop an institutions information, learning, and knowledge commons successfully. Blended librarians complement both the Embedded Librarian and Librarian 2.0. BL does not seek to replace instructional designers and technologists. Rather, it seeks to strengthen the ties and relationship between these professional groups so that together effective cross-functional teams can be created to work with faculty to enhance student learning. (JH)


University of Minnesota Libraries have a library position description framework. This is a standardized approach to articulating ongoing and new librarian roles/responsibilities. This “living document” is divided into domains including: campus engagement, teaching and learning, scholarly communication, e-scholarship and digital tools, “ask us” services, outreach, fundraising, exhibit and event planning, leadership, and management/supervision.

With librarian roles expanding, UMn Libraries decided to reduce librarian efforts in other ways through:

- A process improvement project entitled “From Selection to Access” resulted in much streamlined ordering processes and a significant increase in the use of approval plans, freeing up liaison time.

- making a distinction between what patrons can expect from on-demand reference services (walk-in desks) and expert help services (available by appointment)

- consolidating service points

- decreasing the amount of time that librarians spent at reference desks (JL)


Argues for a paradigm shift in which libraries emphasize support for the scholarship processes (teaching and research) and to re-assess the traditional focus on scholarship products (collections). (JL)


This report explores the implications of an All-Digital library. Beginning on page 48, there are case studies of libraries at universities founded after 2000.

UC Merced outlined some interesting/”different” principles for roles and services. Here are just a few:

- Outsource services that do not need to be performed locally
- Leverage external collaborations
- Do not have a reference desk

In the recommendations beginning on page 60, there is an argument against focused librarian roles -- favoring instead the flexibility of librarians who hold a variety of functions/responsibilities. (JL)

In a 2002 white paper by the ACRL Ad Hoc Task Force on Recruitment, Retention, and Restructuring of human resources in academic libraries, some interesting practices were proposed:

- Be willing to change work schedules
- Determine the librarian-staff ratio needed
- Recognize that your library is likely to need and employ more types of professionals than just librarians (JL)


This paper explores the library administrative implications of Ithaka S+R’s Faculty Survey 2009. They point to the roles of librarians that are highly valued/expected by faculty -- particularly

- acquiring, paying for, and preserving scholarly resources
- teaching support
- increasing faculty productivity of research and scholarship (JL)


University of Arizona has documented their process of re-structuring liaison teams to a functions-based model (as opposed to subject-based services). They outlined three stages:

- building the general frame of change by the restructuring team
- implementation by teams
- managing the newly assigned work

The article is interesting because it outlines some of the social and other challenges to librarian role changes - particularly as librarians moved from a subject-expert to a domain-expert role (i.e., increasing the portfolio of subject responsibilities). An interesting note: the University of Arizona Libraries are grouped by functional teams that are at a different level to discipline-specific teams. (JL)

The University of Arizona Library has been dubbed a “laboratory for learning about organizational change” because of their restructuring and strategic planning initiatives. This article outlines their lessons learned and the procedures used.

The article also outlines a process improvement approach which may help us frame our discussion. They started by looking at the biggest problems facing librarians/patrons - and exploring how they might be resolved by new or re-configured roles.

It’s an 8-step process that includes in its steps:

• develop a clear problem statement from the customer [or librarian] point of view

• map the current process and learn about all tasks involved and any variations

• collect data on the current process

• brainstorm and test possible improvement actions (JL)

**Librarian Roles and Responsibilities**


Article suggests that in order to stay vital within academic institutions, librarians need to integrate themselves more actively into the teaching and learning that takes place in the academy. An interesting point is that the authors feel librarians with faculty status have more opportunities to partner with faculty. Another point was to focus information literacy around curriculum (anchored instruction) and to make the experience for students more active -- i.e. more student involvement so they learn more. Librarians would act more as guides and facilitators. To realized this librarians should also work with technologists and designers to develop better programs, services, and resources. Being innovators ensures a more positive role for librarians in academe. (TS)


To reverse the decline and marginalization that academic libraries in Africa are facing, Moropa suggests that library leaders borrow strategies from the private sector. He cites the following strategies adopted by the University of Pretoria Library Services:

• Foster a culture of openness to new technologies and new developments external to the library

• Conduct regular self-assessment of patron perceptions of library service quality

• Adopt a participatory and shared leadership approach

• Align with the university’s initiatives and developments

• Adopt a strategic plan and organizational structure that includes these unique perspectives and entities:
  - delivery channels defined as physical service, learning center/space, research space, e-service, and virtual research environment

The embedded librarian model suggested for a subject specialist is to be more holistic in approach to one's responsibilities: that is, doing collection development, reference, instruction and even cataloging. Area Studies Librarians might serve as a model of how this is currently done. By being embedded in a department or program, librarians would have more opportunities to interact directly with faculty and staff of a teaching or research unit. The authors identify four driving factors for this new service model that include 1) providing improved access to resources, 2) changing environments for pedagogy, 3) budget, and 4) innovation or experimentation with new models of librarianship. All these factors provide the impetus to move forward with the embedded model. Providing improved access to collections involves allowing the changes in our current model. Digital collections and delivery of resources, and new ways of reaching and serving patrons allows for librarians to not be tied to physical locations. Because of the changes in pedagogical environments brought about from things like distance learning, there are new opportunities for librarians to engage in the classroom. Library instruction does not have to be done in person, but rather one could use a blog or a journaling assignment for example. Diminished budgets are obviously influencing the role of librarians. One way to address the need to reduce costs is to consolidate services. Another is to repurpose space by taking underused Library space and repurposing it to relate to faculty/student needs. Finally, the possibilities of innovation and experimentation can be used within this model. Some of the obstacles are that funding – it might be difficult to afford to embed librarians in every department, and also still have the library space function well for patrons. (TS)


Examines Appalachian State University’s 2008 merger of Access Services and Reference and Instruction staff into Learning and Research Services team. Drivers for change were a new library, updated strategic plan, and student government effort (and $100K financing) to expand library access to 24 hours. Library administration established reorganization principles of improved communication, better decision making, innovation, and providing better service. No reduction in staffing; Learning and Research Services coordinator oversees Information Literacy Librarian, Desk Services Librarian, E-Learning Librarian, and Night Supervisor.

Service improvement achieved through cross-training of librarians and staff for blended services at all service points, improved student assistant training, increased standards and quality - centered on “a philosophical commitment to improve the patron’s library service experience.” Service quality improvements noted including, “moving from enforcement mode” by allowing food, lowering fines and adding grace periods, standardization of desk statistics, creation of student advisory group, creation of new service points staffed by students, improved online chat. Biggest challenge was to blend service philosophies of circulation and reference overcome by trust building exercises, close working proximity, frequent casual meetings, and engaging as many team members as possible in decision-making. Guiding points: anticipate needs of patrons, focus on patron needs first and foremost, change in order to stay relevant, do not be the barrier to services or collections, remain fearless, and have fun. (DE)
Engaging with library users: sharpening our vision as subject librarians for the Duke University Libraries, L. Daniel et al., January 2011  

In an exercise of re-envisioning subject librarians, Duke University Libraries articulated the responsibilities and associated best practices for: engagement, teaching and learning, research services, collection development, scholarly communication, technical services, exhibits, fundraising/grants, and management. Could utilize expectations to assess whether librarians have the proper skills to perform. Could use best practices to ensure functions are met. (DJ)


A 2008 case study of a UK university designed to assess the impact the Academic Liaison Librarians (ALLs) had in three departments: English and Drama, Civil and Building Engineering, and the Department of Materials. Although the study was small and the participants were self-selected, a couple of interesting points were made. Of the skills and traits the faculty valued, subject knowledge was ranked first while pedagogic knowledge placed fifth; and of the services provided those ranked highest were assistance in copyright matters and with the institutional repositories. One interesting note was that the liaisons were listed on the English/Drama department staff webpage. (JC)


This is a case study of restructuring at the University of Arizona. Academic libraries, even at private institutions, can’t expect their funding to return to past levels. In the course of restructuring, the University of Arizona was able to take the opportunity to better integrate the library into the curriculum. Their organization is flatter and more team-based. Librarians don’t manage services and facilities; new high-level staff job titles were created to take their place in these roles. Staff members are encouraged to work on projects that are critical to the library’s future and are rewarded for continually learning and improving.

Classified staff perform chat reference and reference desk work, with professional librarians grouped into Instructional Services or Research Support Services. The Library offers classes for credit. “Strategic long-range planning is conducted by a cross-functional team.” “Library-wide projects have priority over all other projects and functional work in the Libraries.” (HS)

http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/portal_libraries_and_the_academy/v006/6.3reyes.html

Students and faculty want to be self-sufficient and expect to have unmediated, immediate access to information. Combined with decreased funding for public education, academic libraries are facing pressure to provide more instruction outside of the library and the traditional classroom with fewer resources.

Therefore:
- Academic libraries should develop re-useable instructional content whenever possible.
• Librarians should become consultants to teaching faculty and graduate students for incorporating research/information literacy skills into class curricula.

• Libraries need to cultivate virtual learning spaces and build digital learning objects that can be used seamlessly inside and outside of the course management environment.  (JL)


A review of *Imagine your Library’s Future* in which the author comments on the fact that the book looks beyond what has been the typical way of Library planning (i.e., strategic planning). He states that the authors, while not dismissing strategic planning, feel that starting from that point hinders creative approaches to moving libraries into the future (reinforcing what has been rather than what should be.) The authors of the book suggest that developing alternative, reasonable scenarios can help lead to new and appropriate business plans for library organizations and programs. Delums recommends the book because it offers practical models moving libraries towards solutions to future models they might pursue.  (TS)

http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/15228950802203281

Assumes the proposition that libraries are transitioning from system-focused to user focused organizations and purports that librarians’ roles is to show that today’s libraries are facilitators of information flow across communities in addition to providers of information. “If we base our work on user-centered models, the Library-as-Learning Commons can continue to create bridges between faculty and students, students and resources and across curricula…” Libraries should be place-based but not place-bound. Use popular technologies to create communities. NextGen librarians expect options for strategic decision-making, which can make libraries strong and more adaptable.

“Libraries should do more than simply survive; they should flourish” via strategic innovation. “Small steps are fine and provide a base to build on.”  (DE)


For academic libraries to continue serving as a center for teaching, learning, and research in the 21st Century, the key is forming new partnerships that leverage the library’s unique and specialized expertise.

There could be more partnerships with:

• faculty for information literacy, distance education, and faculty development
• the university’s writing center
• the university’s research office for evaluating scholars’ qualifications, grant support, and research support
• teams focusing on the assessment of educational outcomes
• hospitals and health care informatics centers
• student groups for building new student amenities and cultivating a positive student experience
• IT departments
• businesses (e.g., to provide library and information services through contractual agreements)
• other libraries for consortia projects and agreements
• public and school libraries
• virtual library efforts (JL)


Part A: Continuing Discussion on Research Libraries in the 21st Century: Introduction/Prologue to a Fundamental Rethinking/Reconceiving the Library/Challenges and Constraints/Recommendations

This collection of papers is from a 2008 Symposium on the topic of what a 21st century reconceived research library might look like and what its core functions might be. Interesting points in the introductory section are that a reconceived library might take the form of a “distributed project” (p.8) and that librarians will have “deep experience in intellectual problems such as the structure and construct of information”. (p.8) In speaking of the high costs now associated with higher education, Smith argues that libraries will have to focus on specific communities and find their own niche. She sees “special collection” research libraries as a better model for libraries of the future than campus based general-collection libraries are. (p.18) Courant contends that the library’s important contribution to undergraduate education is the teaching of scholarly methods (p.22). Nichols sees the library coming into the academic classroom in a co-teaching role (p.28). Luce argues that the raw data generated by a research project will become more important than the resulting published article, and sees a role for the library in ensuring the quality, integrity and curation of this data (p.43-4). Dillon believes that libraries and academic computing will be merged on most campuses within 5 years and coming to staff these libraries of the future will be “an influx of young, MBA-like professionals” (p. 51). He thinks that there is an important role to be played, “especially if we face up seriously to the thorny issue of assessing information quality.” (p.54) (JC)


This paper examines the impacts, benefits, and tensions that this changing workforce has on academic librarians, with a particular focus on a content analysis of selected job vacancy announcements in the last decade.

The collection of the future may be a collection of collections of interrelated and/or interlinked items. As collections are rethought, so are the services and systems that support those collections. Reference and subject librarians are employing a variety of applications to reach out and offer virtual assistance to users, while traffic at our reference desks declines. (JH)
“Reshaping and Rescoping University Libraries to Fit Changing Academic Requirements,” Frances, Maude, Janet Fletcher and Sue Harmer, IATUL Proceedings (2011). 1-6

This article relates to a reorganization of services at the University of New South Wales. The goal of the reorganization was for the Library to assume a lead role in managing research at the university and integrating it with the information services they already provided. The University seemed to be heavily science oriented.

Steps:
1) combined six previously autonomous libraries into one.
2) restructured TS moving more staff to the unit that dealt with e-resources.
3) created project with three other research libraries to develop and e-repository.
4) developed collaborative research tools and partnered with faculty to gain their insights.
5) developed an online catalog that brought together all content/tools in an interface with consistent look and feel. This environment also allowed faculty to control the content they created which also gave them control of the repositories with the Library.
6) TS was dismantled: a) those dealing with e-resources -> Digital Library Services Dept.; those dealing with print resources -> Central Services Dept.; Documents and CD -> Information Services Dept.
7) training for technical infrastructure units was provided through mentoring, transferring staff.
8) Information Services Dept. was responsible for outreach to the faculty/repositories.
9) Library invested in and encouraged staff to pursue training opportunities especially in areas outside their comfort zone. Managers received training also to better understand how to manage the new work flows and services. (AU)

Re-Skilling for Research, Conducted for Research Libraries UK by Mary Auckland, OBE MSc HonFClip, January 2012: http://www.rluk.ac.uk/files/RLUK%20Re-skilling.pdf

An investigation into the role and skills of subject and liaison librarians required to effectively support the evolving information needs of researchers. Sees trend of subject librarians moving beyond purely information-related activities and towards a greater emphasis on research data management. Identifies high skills gaps in nine key areas:

- Ability to advise on preserving research outputs
- Knowledge to advise on data management and curation, including ingest, discovery, access, dissemination, preservation, and portability
- Knowledge to support researchers in complying with the various mandates of funders, including open access requirements
- Knowledge to advise on potential data manipulation tools used in the discipline/ subject
- Knowledge to advise on data mining
- Knowledge to advocate, and advise on, the use of metadata
- Ability to advise on the preservation of project records e.g. correspondence
- Knowledge of sources of research funding to assist researchers to identify potential funders
- Skills to develop metadata schema, and advise on discipline/subject standards and
practices, for individual research projects

For an example of a recent job posting, see: Research, Instruction and Date Librarian for the Social Sciences - Tisch Library [http://tinyurl.com/socialsciencesdatalibrarian](http://tinyurl.com/socialsciencesdatalibrarian)  (NR)

**Re-thinking positions in academic libraries.** Jackson, Mildred L.  *Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances;* February 2011, Vol. 24 Issue 1, p61-62

Librarians in the twenty-first century require different skills from their predecessors and examine what those skills are and how they correlate with new position descriptions. The paper finds that creative ways of thinking about vacant positions are necessary in the current environment and that different skills are needed in the twenty-first century from those that might have been sought previously.  


This is based on a study of academic librarians in Israel. The skills required for reference librarians have changed in the digital environment. Teaching, guiding, summarizing, and evaluating are more important than they were in the past. Also, since facts are now easy to find on the Internet, patrons ask more complex questions and are often less satisfied with librarian responses. Some librarians have found that students are uninterested in how information is organized and less willing to search on their own. Librarians see a move to virtual reference as inevitable, as information sources move to the virtual environment. The library-as-place becomes less important.  


The authors describe a study at the University of Saskatchewan where organizational culture is assessed. They use the Competing Values Framework (CVF) as the basis for the study. CVF defines four types of organizational culture across a dichotomy of internal/external and flexibility/stability creating four different cultural environments. Librarians were surveyed using the Organizational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI) asking both what culture they think they currently have and what culture they think would be better. Also plotted were differences in responses between tenured/pre-tenured librarians and length of employment. To make an excruciatingly long story short, the results showed that librarians thought of their organization as stable and focused on the external but they wanted it to be more flexible (read: promoting creativity) and still focused on the external. To move to that organizational culture leadership needed to learn how to nurture creativity in the staff and that certain current practices needed to be altered to allow for this creativity to flourish (e.g. they wanted to restructure how performance evaluations were being done).  


Academic librarians already participate in campus committees external to the library, but these committees tend to focus explicitly on information-related services like IT, writing centers, university presses, and instructional programs.
Academic librarians could further contribute our diverse skills to the university campus by creatively engaging in non-library committees related to:

- Strategic planning
- Human resources (for example, work/family support, flex time, job sharing, ergonomics, and labor relations)
- Institutional review boards
- Accreditation preparation (beyond merely the library component)
- Academic program review
- Institutional research
- Campus space master plans
- Student affairs and residential life
- Enterprise systems implementation (such as finance, HR, and advancement)
- Sustainability initiatives
- Community/alumni relations (JL)


The article provides an overview of the responses from the second survey by the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) after the economic downturn and suggests some ways ARL libraries could respond to diminishing budgets. The survey found that for FY 2009-10, ARL library budgets still had not recovered, and in many cases were actually worse than the previous fiscal year. The author goes on to suggest that these continued drop in budgets could force ARL libraries to undertake such cost-cutting measures such as: outsourcing cataloging, stop collecting in areas no longer taught at the institution, consolidate reference desks (which he deems the drop in usage statistics as a sign of success in the transition to electronic access), consolidation of branch libraries and service points, move low use collections to off-site storage and possibly collaborating with other libraries to manage these collections, strengthen new models of service delivery (such as online reference which he says are weakly supported), and digitize legacy collections (pending the outcome of lawsuits against Google Books). Lowry also praises consortial projects already in development at the time of the article, such as HathiTrust, the Columbia-Cornell shared collection development, continued emergence of open-source projects (such as Duraspace and the Open Library Environment Project), and the North Atlantic Storage Trust.


Despite the general overall loss of staff FTE during 2000-2008, the article talks about trends in research university libraries of losing librarian positions and gaining non-librarian professional positions as libraries move away from
print-based collections. Skills and knowledge needed for content development, education, digitization, data curation, scholarly communication, descriptive cataloging, and information design don't necessarily require a librarian education or training. (DJ)

Source list compiled by Jeffrey Loo and Jesse Silva; annotations from all team members.
Appendix B. User Needs Analysis

Faculty and Graduate Students

SUMMARY: Libraries need to work harder to connect with faculty and researchers, to both expose and educate them to what the library can offer, and to get input into what they would like to see the library improve or newly offer. As expected, there is a strong wish for more electronic content, and support for that content, so that working remotely from offices, classrooms, and at home is possible with the full array of library content and services. The boundaries between departments and areas of research have become blurred, so library silos are seen as impediments; the interdisciplinary work needs to be supported and enhanced with library services and programs which focus on interconnectivity. The need for the library to be centrally involved with, and to take a leadership role in, data curation and data management is strongly evident--faculty and researchers alike expect it. A means of integrating and standardizing various data and information silos into a one-stop shop for information discovery and retrieval is important as libraries continue diversify their information resource resources, into a plethora of divergent interfaces and platforms.

BRANDING and OUTREACH - There is insufficient experience among users with the many resources and services the library has to offer, a lack of exposure to library instruction services, and a perception that the libraries give greater priority to support for teaching and learning rather than to research. Perceptions of libraries and their value, along with specific library functions need to be enriched and enhanced with targeted, customized outreach and educational activities which will deepen researcher's understanding of what the library can do. This is especially true for younger researchers, who may turn to social networking spaces to share research-based information.

COLLECTIONS and FACILITIES - There is still a high value placed on broad, complete collections, but users want ready access. That said, it's not surprising that electronic resources and digital collections are seen as important. There is a general transition away from print; electronic is used heavily and most often remotely from both in offices and home. There is a marked decrease in use of the physical library to find information, as it's seen as a place of last resort. This is most pronounced in the sciences, while arts and humanities researchers put a higher value on the services provided in library buildings. Interestingly, it is also perceived that there is a lack of space to work quietly where there is access to necessary materials (i.e., desks, electrical outlets.) Libraries are seen by many as "museums", or regarded with nostalgia rather than vibrant learning centers. The classic organization of libraries with subject based collections grouped in separate library buildings, runs counter to the type of interdisciplinary research we do today.

COLLABORATION and INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK - Most of these articles stressed the role of the library in supporting interdisciplinary and collaborative research, admitting that there is a strong need for dialogue between researchers and libraries to ensure that library services and expertise is developed and implemented most effectively. Strong digital collections, efficient data management, and effective tools are needed to support the increased scale of collaborative research and fieldwork, and the growth of collaborative and interdisciplinary research teams, especially across multiple institutions.

DATA MANAGEMENT, DATA CURATION, and DIGITAL ARCHIVING - There is a general expectation among researchers, that libraries will play a key role as the custodians and manager of digital resources, and therefore digital archiving. Archival and special collection material should be optimized and made available through digitization programs. In general, it is seen that there is an urgent need for librarians and the research community to work together to communicate and clarify the roles and responsibilities of key players, at the institutional and national level. With that in mind, it is clear that researchers' own practice in regard to data curation and
preservation is idiosyncratic, haphazard, and in need of attention. This is compounded by a lack of clear standards for data preservation, retrieval, and viewing mechanisms.

SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION - Researchers rely most heavily on email and email attachments for communication. Virtual spaces and "cloud" applications are beginning to be used to allow for collaborative authoring and version control. Use of such spaces and applications is reliant on a researcher's personal knowledge of such tools, but growing comfort in relying exclusively on digital versions of scholarly materials opens up new opportunities for libraries.

UNIFORMITY and INTEGRATION - Everywhere, there is a strong desire for more fully integrated, standardized search systems (both locally and cross-institutional), as in a front end search system for the library catalog, along with electronic resource platforms and databases. Researchers would like to see the continued and enhanced use of reciprocal access schemes for both print AND electronic content, along with more and better integrated digital finding aids.

• New Directions’ Interviews with UCB Faculty and Graduate Students (UCB, 2009) http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/UCBonly/newdirections


• Faculty Attitudes and Behaviors Regarding Scholarly Communications (UCB, 2007) http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/userresearch/surveys/2007_CDL_OSC_Survey.pdf

• Understanding Research Behaviors, Information Resources, and Service Needs of Scientists and Graduate Students: A Study by the University of Minnesota (2007) http://purl.umn.edu/5546


• Library Resources and Services: Cross Disciplinary Survey of Faculty and Graduate Student Use and Satisfaction (UCB, 1999) http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/userresearch/articles/1999_JAL_article.pdf

**Undergraduate Students**

SUMMARY: While the same general themes pop up with undergraduates in the articles cited, below, it’s a different spin. Collaboration is more evident as a function of social space, rather than in the arrangement of actual library collections, while issues having to do with scholarly communication and data management are barely touched upon. This is perhaps because younger users don't perceive these as needs; resource sharing and data management are more ingrained into their collective educational and personal experience, or they aren't at level where research and study would highlight the need. Library instruction, 24/7 access to collections, and library as social space are the strongest trends.

BRANDING and OUTREACH - A world-class library collection is cited by undergraduates as one of the top reasons they chose to attend UC Berkeley. Undergraduates are keenly aware of the value of our collections, and
understand that the process of using the library throughout their undergraduate careers is a valuable and rewarding learning experience in and of itself, something they can take away with them as a life-long learning tool. That said, students strongly wish for more and better information on what library services are available, for research "workshops" or "mini-seminars" to teach research skills (in general) and on how to use electronic resources, for online tutorials for things students should know where and how to use, and improved library signage on what's where.

COLLECTIONS and FACILITIES - The social role of libraries is important, both as a collaborative study space, and as a getaway from academic life. The academic atmosphere of the library, it should also be noted, is deemed irreplaceable for intensive individual study. Libraries need to provide adequately for both types of usage. Location, schedule, access to materials, atmosphere and academic needs, are primary factors in how often students visit the library. Inconvenient hours (more evening and weekend hours are cited most often as a need), distance from campus (provision for online support/resources continue to be important), the inability to eat and drink while studying, a stuffy and uncomfortable atmosphere, a lack of adequate and diverse group and individual study spaces, and concerns for safety at night, are all cited as factors in why students do not visit the library.

Undergraduate students most often ask for:

- Longer hours, quiet spaces, comfier spaces, outdoor study spaces, group study spaces, more and better seating.
- More micro-computing services/labs, technology support and troubleshooting staff, MAC computers, and up-to-date technology across the board.
- More and better proximity to coffee and snacks, along with study spaces that allow for eating and drinking.

As with other groups, undergraduates want more and better access to online resources, offerings for digital devices, and continued improvement to services which support working from home or off-site. On the other hand, they value and wish for continued easy access to print materials on all different subjects and in different languages, as well as books that are not simply academic, but for general interest and "fun".

OTHER TECHNOLOGY: Many students wish that their instructors used e-books and online course or learning management systems more often. Students prefer, and say they learn more in, classes with online components. In general, students believe that while the library does a good or excellent job at offering online library resources, institutional technology should be improved and expanded. Few students believe that their institution uses the technology it has effectively, and also feel that they know more than their instructors on how to use it.

- UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) (UCB, 2011) http://opa.berkeley.edu/surveys/UCUES/index.html
- Survey of Transfer Students (UCB, 2011) http://opa.berkeley.edu/surveys/transfers/index.html
- ECAR National Study of Undergraduate Students and Information Technology (2011)
http://www.educause.edu/2011StudentStudy

- New Directions’ Summary of Survey of UCB Student Library Employees (UCB, 2009)

- Undergraduates: Current and Retrospective User Data (UCB, 2008)
  http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/userresearch/2008_Undergraduate_Retrospective_Analysis.pdf

- OCLC College Students’ Perceptions of Libraries and Information Resources (2006)
  http://www.oclc.org/reports/perceptionscollege.htm

University/General

SUMMARY: Learning has changed from being organized in stable hierarchical structures that can be treated independently of one another, to being organized "ecologically", where disciplines are integrative and interactive. The learning process has evolved from a listening and watching experience, to one where one learns best actively doing and managing one's own learning. Learning spaces should be attuned to networked individuals, and more open to cross-discipline studies. Libraries will need to find a balance between two extremes: physical vs. virtual facilities, individual vs. community focus, an archive of information vs. a portal to information. Generally speaking, there needs to be a change from "just in case" collections to "just in time" services.

STRATEGY and LEADERSHIP: The days of the library's ability to control what is important are gone. Serving a public good is no longer enough to ensure funding and administrative support. To secure support, the library must now demonstrate how it serves the university mission. Librarians seeking to understand how to make themselves most valued need to keep in mind that academic administrators evaluate their schools, departments and programs on four factors: quality of that program; centrality of that program to the mission of the institution; demand for the offerings of that program; and cost of that program relative to those other factors. Higher priority should be given to research, teaching support, and facilitation functions coupled with a shift away from collections acquisitions and preservation functions.

BRANDING and OUTREACH: The development and marketing of ubiquitous service delivery will become more important for student users who are juggling many priorities in their lives. 24/7 access to digital collections, along with Internet and mobile access to librarians for assistance will be essential for these students who may be doing school work from job sites or family residences. Social marketing of library collections and services can take advantage of the ways that students rely on one another for advice about which library resources to use. It is important that the library be seen by users as the principal starting point in the discovery process, by investing more in discovery tools to aid users.

COLLECTIONS: The excellence of a Library will be determined as much by the quality of the access and services that it provides as by the scale of its collections. Instead of aiming to be a completely comprehensive collection, libraries must develop their holdings more strategically by embracing a model which will ensure access too, and not necessarily ownership of, scholarly materials needed by faculty, students, and other library users -- ownership vs. access. Acquisitions focused on collection building, should be replaced with acquisitions informed by usage data. The traditional collection is built from presumptions of interest and use, while PDA and print-on-demand builds tomorrow's collections with demonstrated use. In the interest of maximizing and revitalizing space, as well as making more materials available online, print books and journals should be preserved (physically and digitally), stored off-site, and made accessible through virtual and physical collections shared across consortia.
FACILITIES: Trends show that most future library space will be taken over by functions that have nothing to do with library collections or services. Space tied up in low-demand activities, like storing books and journals, should be replaced with space used for collaborative learning. Onsite services will include teaching and learning, collaborative study, 24/7 access, tutoring, and cafes. Comfort and collaboration, flexibility and modularity, wireless connectivity and outlet access, integration of academic support services, and food and drink should all be a part of next-gen library spaces.

ASSESSMENT and METRICS: Librarians can no longer rely on their stakeholders (or their own) belief in their importance; they must demonstrate their value. The library’s role in institutional assessment activities needs to be identified and integrated into the institution’s assessment plan. Performance metric definitions are changing. Traditional metrics are measurable, while evolving metrics are aligned with value, though are difficult to quantify. This is further compounded by accreditation demands, that may pull in one or both directions. There is a disconnection between faculty and library directors with regard to the library’s role in teaching and learning; more research is needed as to how libraries are contributing to their libraries’ mission with the support of teaching and learning. That said, there is a need for modern library assessment tools that specifically measure library experiences, information literacy, and research skills, and librarians will need to integrate these library assessments into the institutional student learning assessments.

PROCESSING: Externalize lower-value activity with outsourcing. Outsource the processing of physical books and journals with shelf-ready, pre-cataloged acquisitions where possible. Where not possible, outsource cataloging to specialized vendors, like OCLC. Partner with vendors to digitize, preserve, and market specialized collections and materials (previously available only as print). Use self-checkout.

REFERENCE and INSTRUCTION: Librarians should be embedded in online courses (embedded eBrarian), departments, and research teams, while specialized staff lead campus efforts in academic technology, e-science, and digital information resources. Librarians should be focused on teaching and learning, information literacy skills, and close collaboration with faculty as department "informationists" or "shared specialists" to support classroom instruction, multimedia production support, and instructional design. Collaborative and virtual 24/7 reference should be offered with chat, e-mail, phone, and other emerging technologies to support work from hand-held devices. Research support services should be offered for copyright advising, publication support, and data curation.

TECHNOLOGY: Web services and multimedia support is key. From their personal devices and relevant applications, at minimum, users should be able to search the catalog, locate available work space, reserve study rooms, have real-time chat with librarians, find hours/locations, view the webcam coffee shop line, and locate available work-stations in the library. As self-paced online courses increase, the demand for online, on-demand library tutorials should also increase. Peak times for services like virtual reference, online course reserves and document delivery will be less predictable, so 24/7 service will be important. The potential and flexibility of cloud computing is appealing, but there are many issues (questions of security, risks, governance, among others) to be explored. A strategic plan that addresses cloud computing is needed to address the potential benefits and hazards of students and faculty working and storing data and other information in the cloud.

STAFF: Trends indicate that library staff must engage more directly with student and faculty needs, but significant staff time is instead devoted to cataloging and processing physical books and journals, and there is a declining utilization of circulation and reference services. Furthermore, librarians may lack skills or interest in supporting new services, and faculty do not always see librarians as a useful resource for teaching and research support. Libraries should identify new strategies for integrating younger librarians into a demographically older workforce. Ideas such as multi-generational work-teams, and stronger orientation and mentoring programs are needed. Development and adoption of cultural competencies among academic librarians will become essential to
the culturally sensitive delivery of library services. Finally, new strategies for recruiting and retaining librarians from underrepresented groups will be essential to staying relevant to faculty and students in the near and long-term future.

- Redefining the Academic Library: The Provosts Report (2011)

- Ithaka S+R Library Survey (2010)

- ACRL Environmental Scan (2010)
  http://www.al.org/acrl/files/publications/whitepapers/EnvironmentalScan201.pdf

  http://www.acrl.al.org/value/

  http://www.oclc.org/reports/2010perceptions.htm

- General Education in the 21st Century: A Report of the UC Commission on General Education (UC, 2007)
  http://cshe.berkeley.edu/publications/publications.php?id=254

- Pew Internet and American Life Reports about Libraries
  http://www.pewinternet.org/topics/Libraries.aspx

- Attitudes of Presidents and Provosts of the University Library (2007)
  http://www2.fiu.edu/~ereserve/010011463-1.pdf

- What CAOs Want from their Libraries (2007)

- Blue Ribbon Committee on Library (UCB, 1998)
  http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/AboutLibrary/reports/BRC.pdf

Sources compiled by Elizabeth Dupuis; summary created by Dana Jemison
Appendix C. SWOT Report

Our strengths are:
- Our staff – motivated, talented, independent thinkers.
- Our users – they’re diverse, loyal, and they need us.
- Our subject expertise is both deep and broad.
- Our organization – we’re part of a world-class university system with a multi-faceted mission.
- Our collection is best-in-class – both print and online

Our weaknesses are:
- Our organization is complex, fragmented, and somewhat inflexible.
- Outside perceptions – libraries/librarians can be perceived as tradition-bound
- Technology – we’re lacking in data about our operations, and our staff in some cases needs better training.
- Our staffing is too low, somewhat unbalanced, and unprepared for succession.
- Economic issues – our funding is limited, and our salaries aren’t competitive with peer institutions.

Our opportunities include:
- Nationwide library leadership – we are prominent in the HathiTrust project, and we could be a role model to other libraries.
- Partnerships with other departments at Berkeley and other UC campuses – we should look for ways to leverage our position to improve systems and collaboration
- New education/outreach opportunities – we’ve already taken a leadership role in Open Access on campus, and we could be integral to online education
- New and potential funding sources – we could generate revenue from a student fee, from raising the price of public library cards, by installing solar panels on our buildings, or other partnerships/grants
- New projects and expansion of current projects – digitization through HathiTrust and other projects, providing access to works digitized elsewhere, support for e-research.
- Marketing our services – we could “toot our own horn” more about our contributions to student learning and faculty research
- Improving our organization – prioritizing, outsourcing, taking part in OE

Our threats include:
- Funding/budget issues – the cuts we’ve already made, and the potential for more
• Organizational threats – more mandates from CDL/UCOP, loss of institutional knowledge with retirements, potential for the campus to see us as less-than-integral to the university’s mission

• User perceptions – patrons whose expectations remain high despite budget/staffing cuts, are unaware of our services

• Outside threats we have little control over, such as legislation against open access

Summary created by Hilary Schiraldi and Jesse Silva
Appendix D. Librarian Functions List

In response to “what are the varied functions/tasks that librarians perform?”

Selection / Acquisitions:
Responsible for shaping and managing a complex array of research materials in support of the University's teaching and research missions. Develop and implement Collection Development policies and perform selection for a wide range of materials (including traditional print collections, data sets, visual materials, manuscripts and archives, electronic resources, other materials in special format, etc.). Work collaboratively with other UC libraries and nationally concerning collection issues. Consult with faculty concerning resources. Anticipate scholarly and teaching needs by documenting new intellectual and social trends and by being apprised of new technologies. Work with vendors, publishers and donors who produce, collect and supply resources. Manage funds and advocate for new funding opportunities.

Shape and Manage Collections
- Develop and maintain subject expertise
- Develop, revise and follow collection development policy
- Evaluate collections for collection development purposes (analyze usage data, or use other collection analysis tools)
- Review and evaluate exchange programs
- Facilitate the process of putting faculty-authored articles into E-scholarship or other digital repositories
- De-select obsolete or dated materials
- Make decisions for archiving (JSTOR, WEST), preservation
- Plan and implement digitization projects
- Digitize primary resources already held in our collection for wider distribution
- Decide best use of limited space for collections (select materials to move to storage)
- Assess collection - is it meeting user needs?
- Provide/promote access to freely available online scholarly publications via OskiCat, Melvyl, ERF, library websites, etc. as appropriate
- Liaise with faculty
- Cultivate donors for special collections
- Attend subject councils, collection council and other meetings relevant to collection planning
- Participate in CDL bibliographers groups
- Collaborate with regional and national collection development partners (e.g. UC, Stanford, nationally)
- Publicize and promote collections in various ways (such as creating print and web guides, physical and virtual exhibits, research projects, etc.)
- Preserve resources unique to the Berkeley libraries.
- Collaborate nationally/internationally & formulate strategies to preserve shared information resources.

Selection
- Set up and manage approval plan profiles, blanket orders and standing orders
- Select materials determining their relevance based on UCB’s curriculum, research needs, faculty interests, and peer institutions’ holdings, and using tools such as publisher catalogs, vendor databases, and subject specific publications.
- Decide on best formats/types (e.g. rare, personal collections, print, electronic, DVD, CD, microform.)
- Identify and select freely accessible online scholarly publications (journals, databases, websites, etc.)
- Establish and evaluate resource trials
- Balance selection between print and electronic materials
- Appraise and select materials for archival collections
- Decide whether to duplicate material already held on campus for course reserves and faculty requests
- Coordinate with other selectors for shared and interdisciplinary purchases
- Advocate for purchases for the Library’s collections
- Evaluate gifts for inclusion in the collection
- Review incoming materials
- Make binding decisions
- Review journal subscriptions for renewal or cancellation
- Review e-resources packages, Tiers 1 & 2 purchases etc for CDL-initiated collecting
- Decide whether to replace lost and missing materials
- Monitor e-resources and report problems to library staff, vendor or publisher
- Digital Curation - determine which items should be purchased via e-packages
- Conduct intensive book-buying trips to various parts of the world to collect hard to acquire or unique resources.

**Vendor/Publisher/Donor Relations**
- Influence publishers to provide digital materials and licenses
- Influence publishers on pricing and price models
- Work with vendors on what to digitize next, fulfill needs, etc
- Establish and maintain vendor, publisher, dealer, bookseller relationships
- Discover vendors and other suppliers
- Evaluate vendor performance
- Acquire and load vendor supplied acquisition records
- Work with development office to raise money for collections
- Troubleshoot e-resource problems
- Write, review and approve licensing agreements with vendors for electronic materials
- Educate faculty and students regarding fair use copyright and open access issues.
- Pursue open access publications for Berkeley’s collection
- Build and maintain relationships with potential donors of materials (authors, collectors) and/or donors for financial support
- Work with departmental development staff to contribute and respond to departmental development goals
- Work with publishers/vendors to build collections and determine what subject area material is lacking

**Fund Management / Budgeting**
- Justify current collection allocation and advocate for extra funds (faculty start-up, one-time money, large purchases, etc.)
- Manage collection funds
- Manage specific types of funds (e.g. endowments, other non-state funds, etc.)
- Generate reports for selectors (e.g. showing what's been purchased under what fund)
- Interface with business services
- Approve invoices for payment
- Review and claim for open orders on encumbered funds for claiming, dropping, etc.
- Monitor fund expenditures
- Prepare funding models for the AUL for Collections and the Collections Budget Group
- Review and place orders vendors’ automated ordering systems such as GOBI
- Balance mono and serial expenditures based on needs of discipline

**Cataloging / processing of material**
Responsible for the bibliographic content within the Library's catalogs as well as the accuracy and reliability of that content. Collaborates with UC libraries and on a national level on cooperative cataloging projects and to establish cataloging standards and best practices. Creates metadata in MARC and non-MARC schemas in all languages for all formats. The work performed by catalog librarians supports Library functions such as reference, instruction, circulation, collection development, and acquisitions. It also directly contributes to the discovery and access by faculty, students, staff, as well as to other UC, national, and international libraries of the material purchased, licensed, and endowed to the Library.

**Bibliographic Access:**
- Original and copy cataloging of materials in all subject areas, formats (e.g. print, electronic, monographs, serials, microfilm, CD-ROMS, including rare books, maps, audio, video, pictorial collections, preservation materials, etc.) and languages, to bring out the essential content.
- Contribute original authority records and bibliographic records to the national database via the NACO and PCC programs
- Record maintenance and complex record problem solving
- Subject analysis
- Classification
- Address catalog content issues (e.g. inconsistencies, enhancements, etc.)
- Archival collections processing (manuscripts and pictorial material) for access and preservation. Respond to questions, special cataloging requests, etc. from Library colleagues, students, professors
- RUSH catalog materials for course reserve, requested by patron, special requests
- Outsourcing (specifications for cataloging, physical processing, "shelf-ready"; interface with vendors; identify and resolve problems)
- Work with other library departments and units to determine needs, create, and enhance non-MARC metadata for special collections.
- Development of new services/workflows/projects (e.g. WorldCat Cataloging Partners (formerly PromptCat), BadCat, California Newspaper Project, etc.)
- Formulate standards-based strategies and manage initiatives to provide online access to unique archival materials
- Develop and provide training for UC catalogers
- Write grants (e.g. California Newspaper Project)

**Collaboration**
- Provide advice to catalog colleagues locally and at other institutions
- Work with other UC campuses to create efficiencies, standards, best practices in cataloging and related areas.
- Work with cataloging partners (internal and external e.g. other UC campuses) to make use of/share unique expertise.
- Liaise with selectors / provide curatorial assistance
- Collaborate with other library units to resolve common problems or accomplish shared goals
- Serve on Library (e.g. CMC, PSC, ILSSC, etc.), state-wide (e.g. CLA, NCTPG, etc.), UC-wide (e.g. HOTS, CAMCIG, NGTS, etc.) and national committees/organizations (e.g. ALA, ALCTS, NASIG)
- Work with digital data and digital collection owners to determine needs for non-MARC metadata

**Policy Development & Implementation**
- Set policy for cataloging and metadata standards
- Keep up-to-date on national trends and developments
- Communicate news, priorities, policies, etc. outward to the Library as a whole (e.g. blog)
- Develop and provide training for local staff
• Develop and provide training for student employees
• Contribute to the development of national policy
• Locally implement changes in national cataloging rules and guidelines
• Write, edit, review local documentation
• Provide “big picture” goals for catalog content and indexing

Other:
• Prioritize departmental work, projects, etc.
• Provide direction and leadership in the organization and retrieval of library resources
• Provide technical support for proxy, VPN, printing, scanning, basic computer literacy
• Personalized library services for patrons (e.g. article retrieval, research, creation of bibliographies for specific projects, etc.)
• Troubleshoot e-access problems
• Share reference and instruction expertise with other library professionals (reference roundtable, campus-wide, UC-wide, nation-wide)
• Provide expertise enabling use of primary sources and special formats such as historical textual or visual documents, manuscripts, archival materials, early printed books, audio and video recordings, etc.

Liaison Role
The library liaison facilitates communication about library resources, services, collections, initiatives, and expertise across library constituents to ensure that the Library is effectively supporting the research, teaching, learning, and other needs of our community. Liaison responsibilities focus on personalized interaction and assistance and being visible and accessible to our community. Activities include: (1) Promotion of library services, collections, and resources (i.e., marketing and outreach); (2) Intensive and personalized consultations; (3) Community engagement and library visibility; (4) User needs assessment and strategic planning; (5) Relationship building; (6) Engagement with and advocacy for emerging academic and research paradigms; (7) Collaboration on special projects in conjunction with our patrons; (8) Internal facilitation and collaboration; (9) Facilitation of external partnerships; and (10) Fundraising and development.

Promotion of library services, collections and resources (marketing and outreach)
• Inform patrons of our collections, services, resources, and expertise through a tailored/personalized approach
• Explain the library’s services and resources in support of research, teaching, learning, and academic service
• Introduce new faculty and students to the library through orientations, workshops, welcome letters, and open houses
• Keep patrons up to date via newsletters, email, blog posts, etc., to new library services and resources
• Engage with social media and technologies to promote library services

Intensive and personalized consultations
• Provide personalized consultations across a spectrum of intensive research needs - including citation-based metrics (e.g., impact factors, h-indexes), efficient and comprehensive ways to keeping current with the literature, interlibrary loan services, online access and connectivity troubleshooting, data retrieval, data licensing, and citation management
• Troubleshoot patron complaints or difficulties
• Provide research consultations
• Work with publishers and vendors for special access needed by scholars
• Provide instructional and curricular support to faculty and other instructors
Community engagement and library visibility

- Provide library orientations and tours to departmental students and faculty
- Develop instructional workshops targeting department needs
- Develop collaborative programs with campus groups
- Reach out to student/academic groups/programs that may not be heavy library users
- Reach out to the general public and other California institutions
- Develop library exhibits
- Host campus events in the library
- Be visible and attend department meetings and events like seminars and conferences

User Needs assessment and strategic planning

- Anticipate future directions of Berkeley instruction and research and suggest responsive library actions
- Regularly communicate user needs and behavior with other library departments
- Attend departmental meetings to learn about information needs
- Conduct assessments/surveys on user needs
- Analyze collections and usage statistics to understand user behavior
- Recommend improvements to user experiences
- Analyze research trends for the department and be aware of the department’s current and future programs
- Identify current and potential resources for faculty research
- Meet with the departmental dean/administration to assess the library’s role in meeting long term goals of the department
- Understand what materials are needed by different academic programs

Relationship building

- Serve as a contact to librarians at other institutions
- Provide library services embedded into instructional classes and research environments
- Meet with the faculty, the dean, the directors of undergraduate and graduate studies, and other departmental stakeholders on a regular basis
- Develop strong working relationships with faculty, students, and staff (e.g., administrative assistants and academic coordinators)
- Facilitate multidisciplinary research by engaging with “disparate” departments and forging connections among the stakeholders
- Connect our patrons to contacts and resources outside their immediate discipline
- Reach out to libraries to collaborate on providing services to patrons

Engagement with and advocacy for emerging academic and research paradigms

- Educate the campus about scholarly communication, digital scholarship (e.g., e-research, data services, digital laboratory notebooks), research ethics, publishing trends, information literacy, digital collections, copyright and fair use, and repository services
- Advocate for the above academic paradigms

Collaboration on special projects in conjunction with our patrons

- Contribute to faculty, staff, and university projects as an information and technology specialist (e.g., digitizing collections, building digital repositories, online instruction, online tools)
- Support the academic accreditation process
- Consult on new research projects
• Seek opportunities for collaboration with researchers and instructors (e.g. creating digital collections, research consultations, etc.)

**Internal facilitation and collaboration**

• Coordinate/facilitate library activities/services between discrete library divisions
• Promote library-wide awareness of emerging library activities and projects

**Facilitation of external partnerships**

• Develop programs and services for our external partners (e.g., LBNL)
• Explain library services and operations to our partners to foster understanding and effective collaboration
• Project management of inter-institutional projects
• Work with other library units to ensure core services are available per external agreements
• Work with external libraries as needed to create and provide library services
• Work with workforce development groups to create new services and address special needs of external partners
• Provide collection consultation (e.g. organization, retention, donation, etc.) for external partners
• Respond to inquiries of possible future partnerships
• License resources (e.g. journals) specifically for external partners
• Provide specialized library services (e.g. online literature searching) for external partners

**Fundraising and development**

• Engage with development and fundraising efforts
• Cultivate relationships with donors and potential donors

**Unit/Department Management**

Responsible for setting unit priorities in support of the University's teaching and research missions and participating in library-wide planning; leads and supports the unit staff in developing and implementing innovative and effective services that are responsive to and anticipate user needs; plans, analyzes and manages priorities and resources for effective and efficient operations of the unit; directs the development and maintenance of the library facilities, collections, and/or services; and establishes and maintains strong relations with library and campus colleagues

• Develop and manage unit vision, goals, services, assignments, and workflows
• Initiate, plan, and/or participate in user assessments, service redesigns, and facilities renovations/reconfigurations
• Communicate and collaborate with other Library units to ensure effective policies and procedures are designed, implemented, and revised as needed
• Plan staffing coverage and address problems; may work with Operations Manager to accomplish
• Plan and submit library (building, circulation, reference) hours; may work with Operations Manager to accomplish
• Determine needed facilities/equipment repairs and maintenance; may work with Operations Manager to accomplish
• Lead regular staff meetings and respond to staff needs
• Participate in Roundtable (managers') meetings bi-monthly
• Participate in unit head meetings with peers as scheduled
• Identify issues to address with supervisor and/or AUL/Director
• Establish and maintain relationships with the administration, faculty and students served
• Develop unit-specific policies and procedures as needed
• Address problems or concerns about unit-specific and library-wide policies and procedures
• Address problems or needs related to major facilities, safety and security issues (may work with department building managers, PPCS, UCPD, and others)
• Monitor and manage unit (GA) budget, endowments, and other sources of unit funding
• Approve/respond to purchase requests (e.g. supplies and equipment)
• Approve/respond to leave reports, vacation requests, schedule changes, and professional development and travel requests
• Assign and manage staff schedules, task assignments, and special projects
• Plan staff vacations or absences, and rearrange or cover public service desks
• Inform staff when they are close to maximum vacation accruals, arrange to address
• Prepare performance evaluations and review job descriptions for staff
• Serve as review initiator for librarian reviews
• Ensure student library employees are hired, trained and scheduled as needed
• Manage staff recruitment, orientations, training and development
• Address human resources problems
• Ensure staff training plans and procedure manuals are up-to-date
• Ensure web site is up-to-date
• Troubleshoot equipment and facilities problems; report and follow up as needed
• Coordinate selection of volumes and shipments for storage (NRLF) and weeding
• Submit annual unit statistics (e.g. reference, instruction, and collection)
• Arrange orientations for new students and new faculty as needed
• Arrange tours for alumni, potential students, faculty recruits, and donors as needed
• Cultivate and communicate with donors (thank yous, events, etc.)
• Address safety and security issues as needed
• Plan for changes or updates to exhibits as needed; may prepare, mount, and maintain exhibits
• Prepare and submit unit annual report/fact sheet
• Send library updates/news to faculty and students as needed
• Participate in meetings with relevant campus staff and faculty (Deans/Department Chairs, department/Center/Institute/ORU meetings, ETS, academic support units, etc)
• Support departmental seminar rooms with logistics and technology
• Prepare reports and statistics for departmental accreditation reviews (on average every 5 years) as needed
• Prepare proposals for external funding for services/staffing (may work with business services, development, and others)

Administration
Responsible for enhancing the vision of the Library as an exemplar of research, scholarship, learning, teaching, and collaboration; establishes a clear direction for the future of the Library as an integrated system; directs operations of one or more divisions of the Library; effects positive change in a large, complex academic library; serves as a fair, progressive leader to the Library's staff; leverages and garners resources for maximum impact on the Library; creates and communicates Library policies that support the above activities; represents the Library on campus, within the UC System, and beyond; and advocates for the Library, library staff, library values, and present/future roles of academic libraries

• Provide strategic, library-wide vision for a primary aspect of library functions (e.g. collections/ collection services, public services/educational initiatives); lead library-wide discussions and decision-making about issues and trends related to a primary aspect of library functions; review/assess/improve policies and practices as needed; may lead function councils
• Strategically plan for high-level infrastructure, personnel, and budget issues; serve on Library’s senior leadership team (Admin)
• Strategically plan physical spaces and related issues with services, staffing, and renovations (including campus libraries and NRLF)
• Strategically plan collections-related policies and procedures
• Strategically plan and evolve organizational structure
• Set financial strategy (e.g. allocate current budgets, increase financial stability, reduce unnecessary costs, identify new revenue sources such as business partnerships, grants, donations)
• Develop fundraising campaign directions in partnership with UL and Development Office; cultivate and communicate with donors
• Set guidelines for service delivery and consistency of service quality (identify campus needs, best practices, opportunities for improvement)
• Develop and adjudicate policies; collaborate with legal counsel as needed
• Initiate, develop, evaluate and review agreements with partner institutions and professional organizations (e.g. cooperative collection development, interlibrary lending, digitization, shared staffing/outsourcing, LBNL, CRL, ARL, IFLA, OCLC, Stanford/UT Austin)
• Serve as visible and vocal presence for communicating the direction of the Library to library staff, UCB community, and within UC System
• Serve as leader within the Library (fair and open leadership, willingness to hear and explore new ideas, inclusive management practices, encourage collaboration, address pressing problems)
• Direct, manage, and supervise librarians, managers, departments, programs, and service points
• Serve as review initiator and final AUL reviewer for librarian positions
• Handle specific staffing issues (e.g. recruitment, reassignment, interim plans, HR problems, grievances) within the policies, contracts, and procedures established by the University
• Provide safe and productive working environments for Library patrons and staff
• Build relationships and collaborate with other campus leaders and faculty (Provost, Vice Provosts, Deans, Department Chairs, Academic Senate, Graduate Assembly, ASUC, Centers and Institutes, etc)
• Build relationships and collaborate with other UC leaders (10 campus consortium, CDL, SOPAG, related committees)
• Represent the Library in University/regional/national/international forums related to academic libraries

**Reference and Instruction:**

Responsible for providing in-person and remote reference services to faculty, students, staff, and public patrons using the medium most appropriate for efficiently connecting patrons to the resources they need. Also responsible for providing instruction at various levels (introductory, advanced, and individual) about individual library resources and policies, course specific research methodologies, as well as the scholarly process including issues of relevance to scholars such as fair use, open access, and data management.

• Design and teach in-person bibliographic instruction classes (basic to advanced level)
• Design and teach library/research sessions for course-specific classes (traditional and hybrid)
• Provide support and guidance for faculty instructors to augment their course design
• Provide “train-the-trainer” instruction to GSI’s and undergraduate instructors
• Develop discipline-based student learning outcomes and assessment
• Provide instruction to non-faculty Berkeley staff and researchers
• Provide tool-specific training sessions (for datasets, citation managers, etc.)
• Explain the lifecycle process/publishing patterns of various materials (government documents, business filings, etc.)
• Design and maintain electronic guides and bibliographies or maintain a B-Space presence for specific courses and research topics
• Create online tutorials using streaming media (Captivate, Camtasia, Jing, etc)
• Design and maintain web pages for library services
• Provide just-in-time instruction at a reference desk, office, or using chat, email, phone
• Locate hard-to-find materials that patrons may not be aware of
• Explain and demonstrate the efficient use of a wide variety of indices, databases, and other research tools
• Locate research material from outside the UCB library (including archival material, governmental websites, etc.) and make referrals to those libraries and unique collections
• Coordinate space and technology for a class
• Staff reference desk(s)
• Provide virtual reference (email, chat, phone)
• Provide drop-in office reference
• Reference by appointment
• Provide tours and orientations on library facilities, procedures, and resources to new faculty, graduate students, undergrads and community patrons.
• Educate patrons about scholarly issues such as fair use of material, open access, plagiarism
• Help undergrads and grads develop research strategies for assignments and/or projects
• Support intensive research for capstone, thesis, dissertation through research consultations
• Provide reference assistance for non-English materials, requiring language expertise
• Provide expertise about emerging topics (e.g. data management, information repositories, etc.)

Professional Responsibilities

The University Library benefits from having a professional staff that is engaged with current issues in librarianship, aware of trends and best practices in the profession, and in touch with library leaders around the country and world. Towards that end, both the University's Academic Personnel Manual and our union's Memorandum of Understanding encourage and require professional development activities, as cited below:

"The University of California recognizes professional development of librarians as beneficial to the individual, the libraries, and the University. Professional development opportunities contribute to the professional growth of the librarian, enabling greater effectiveness as academic appointees and thus enhancing her/his service to the University." [APM 360 - Appendix A. Professional Academic Issues]

"There shall be reasonable flexibility and reasonable individual discretion for librarians in the use of University time so that they may function as academic appointees of the University of California. Choice of other activities such as study, writing, research, public service, and requests to attend workshops, institutes, and conferences, as well as the choice of professional organizations in which to be active, are left to the discretion of the individual librarian." [MOU Article 3.A. Professional Activities and Development]

Professional Activity outside the Library
• Membership and activity in professional and scholarly organizations
• Participation in library and other professional meetings and conferences
• Consulting
• Teaching and lecturing
• Editorial activity

University and Public Service
• Library-wide and campus-wide committee service
- LAUC-B or LAUC service
- Professional librarian services to the community, the state, and the nation

**Research and Other Creative Activity**
- Writing articles, books, book reviews, blogs, columns
- Creating exhibits or online tools
- Presentations of research at conferences and the like

**Related Skills (may be applicable to many librarians):**
- Grant writing
- Project management
- Experiment with newer ways of providing services (i.e. chat)
- Learn/Use technologies
- Engage speakers/visitors/volunteers

**New Roles**

**Issue expertise**
- New/Social media (including digital interactivity, wikis, blogs, twitter, facebook, etc)
- Web services (including discovery tools, virtual presence beyond traditional web site)
- Online education (including pedagogical and delivery issues)
- E-Research (including data management, training, all disciplines)
- Digital Assets (including data curation, asset mgmt, preservation strategies, open access)
- Digital humanities
- First-year experience (including recruitment, connections with freshman/transfer students)
- User experience, design, assessment
- Geographic Information Systems (GIS)
- Mass digitization and access (including HathiTrust, Google Books, new opportunities)
- Disabilities services (including web accessibility, service expectations, new models with e-resources)
- Copyright/Fair Use (including training for library staff and faculty, e-reserves, streamed media, etc)
- Metadata (including schemas for digitized and born-digital content)
- Digital reformatting of fugitive analog resources for preservation and access.
- Creation of new tools to aid researchers in their work (e.g. DMPTool)
- Publishing the work of our faculty and students (e.g., eScholarship)
- Web archiving as a form of collection development and preservation
- Creation of information
- Shaping bibliographic tools to meet user needs (e.g. working with vendors)
Appendix E. Academic Department/Program Data

The data below were compiled from CalProfiles and CalAnswers. Using this data, the client base for liaisons can be estimated as follows:

In 2010-11 campus reported 1,426 faculty/instructors and 9,100 grad students associated with the departments and programs listed below; and approximately 26,000 undergrads. Since undergraduate students often have multiple majors and may not declare their intentions until late in their academic careers, the table below shows enrollments in courses by department but calculations across all selector/liaisons is not a meaningful figure. For high-level modeling purposes this would result in the following client base per selector/liaison librarian:

- with 35 librarians as liaisons, averages are 41 faculty and 260 graduate students/librarian
- with 30 librarians as liaisons, averages are 48 faculty and 303 graduate students/librarian
- with 25 librarians as liaisons, averages are 57 faculty and 364 graduate students/librarian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Department</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>2010-2011</th>
<th>Enrollments 2010-11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 28</td>
<td>938 987 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Studies</td>
<td>(Not a separate dept)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology, Archaeology</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 116</td>
<td>2020 1985 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 54</td>
<td>706 855 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 13</td>
<td>613 815 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 31</td>
<td>989 94 181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology, Molecular &amp; Cell Biology, Integrative Biology</td>
<td></td>
<td>96 470</td>
<td>15573 9501 1529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>105 1557</td>
<td>1217 7819 13233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Studies</td>
<td>(Not a separate dept)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Studies</td>
<td>(Part of E.Asian Std)</td>
<td>8 7</td>
<td>462 358 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics, Greek, Latin</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 33</td>
<td>1067 350 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Chemistry: Chemistry, Chemical Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td>55 504</td>
<td>7830 2605 3257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Environmental Design: Architecture, City &amp; Regional Planning, Environmental Design, Landscape Architecture, Urban Design</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Natural Resources: Ag &amp; Environmental Chemistry, Ag &amp; Resource Economics, Environmental Science, Nutritional Science, Plant Biology, Energy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>4224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demography</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not a separate dept)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth &amp; Planetary Science</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asian Electronic collections (Part of E.Asian Std)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering, Applied Science &amp; Tech, Bioengineering, Civil &amp; Environmental Engineering, Computer Science, Electrical Engineering, Ocean Engineering (Half of Engineering)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>4544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English &amp; American Literature</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Studies, Media Studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not a separate dept)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender and Women's Studies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Engineering, Operations Research, Material Science, Mechanical Engineering, Nuclear Engineering (Half of Engineering)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>4544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International &amp; Area Studies (Ugrad mjo/ID grad)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ischool (Group liaison)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Studies (Part of E.Asian Std)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaica Studies (Half of NE)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Enroll</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean Studies (Part of E.Asian Std)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American Studies (Not a separate dept)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Studies (Ugrad major)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>9452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval Studies (Not a separate dept)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern Studies (Half of NE Studies)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optometry, Health &amp; Medical Sci, Vision Sci</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>4924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>2312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health, Biostatistics, Epidemiology, Infectious Diseases &amp; Immunity</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies (Ugrad major)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetoric</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slavic &amp; East European Studies</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian Studies (Half of S SE Asian)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies (Half of S SE Asian)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish and Portuguese</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater &amp; Dance &amp; Performing Arts</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,426</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,100</strong></td>
<td><strong>95,489</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F. Overviews of Roles

Informed by the approaches employed by peer institutions and an analysis of the specific opportunities for Berkeley, the team produced overviews for each of the primary roles of librarians. The overviews include potential approaches for addressing core responsibilities in different ways to take into account the potential for a reduce librarian workforce. The six overviews cover: Leadership library-wide; Management of Library/Unit; Instruction; Reference; Selector/Liaison; and Acquisitions, Cataloging, & Special Collections Processing).

Leadership (Librarywide) Role (Version 2: March 12, 2012)

I. Highlights of current environment:
- Issues/Initiatives arise that need librarian engagement; assignments are made ad hoc
- Leadership for these issues is added to current assignment, often without clear idea of what current responsibilities can/should be reduced or handled differently
- Issue leaders do not necessarily have formal authority for leadership of the issue – either as a contact or a resource for library colleagues, campus contacts and/or other partners
- Uneven demands/expectations/opportunities for individual librarians
- Many issues default to AUL/Directors without other designated leadership
- Some lost opportunities with initiatives which could be very interesting for the librarian and for which UCB could have a stronger, louder national voice
- New, emerging librarian roles need to be emulated
- Interdisciplinary issues lack a formal cross-subject, cross-library venue
- Emerging topics could use a team-based approach as they are tackled
- This kind of service is currently required for promotion and advancement within the Librarian series

II. Elements of librarian role/professional responsibilities critical to consider:
- Professional engagement
- Engage with current issues
- Aware of trends & best practices
- In touch with leaders elsewhere
- Research & creative activity; scholarship/academic work
- Advancing issues for campus, state, nation (the larger picture)
- UCB representation on key national/international issues
- Specialization and areas of expertise
- Diverse skills (e.g., blended librarian)
- How does this mesh with other librarian obligations (e.g., unit meetings; department meetings; regular Library committees, councils, etc.; LAUC service)?

III. Approach:
All librarian positions include a percentage of time (such as 25-30%) for the librarian's leadership of an issue or an initiative important to the Library (e.g. ideas listed in New Librarian Roles section of Function List, limited-time projects such as the Moffitt Renovation, and possibly some current assignments needing ownership as a result of re-envisioning-motivated reorganizations). Critical issues may be identified by library administration and/or library staff; some issues will be suggested through our collaborations (such as within UC System, with ARL, etc.) Specific assignments will be
chosen based on the librarian’s personal interests and expertise. Taking leadership for the issue means that the librarian will be actively engaged in the larger professional/national/campus conversations, educate UCB Library colleagues about the issues, recommend and manage implementation of ideas adopted by the UCB Library, and serve as a primary contact on the issue. These assignments can evolve or be swapped over time to meet changing needs and interests.

[Alternative A: Fewer number of librarians fill other functions (selector/liaison/reference/instruction/cataloging/processing/management/administration) in order to create separate positions dedicated to these issues. Alternative B: Hire temporary librarians for these roles. Alternative C: combination of A+B. Alternative D: Team-based approach, perhaps with the lead being the chair of a committee.]

IV. Motivation:
- Addresses librarians’ concerns that there is too little time to develop personal expertise and produce research/scholarship (see Professional Responsibilities in Functions List)
- Addresses organizational need for identifying professional staff to become expert on issues considered critical to our library’s mission and future
- Formally commits time within librarian assignments to these types of issues (so we take this into account as we consider other roles and manageable assignments)
- Formalizes the release time to work on special projects
- Addresses librarian need to keep up-to-date in the profession

V. Potential benefits:
- Satisfying work
- Librarians can develop broader skills and abilities; librarian skills are being refreshed to adapt to new academic trends
- Broader vision
- Devoted time to work on special projects
- Leadership opportunities
- Encourages creativity
- Cultivates a culture of leadership in academic work on campus – “gravitas”
- Librarians are more visible
- Librarian can contribute to more campus conversations
- Library can provide new services utilizing new skills/knowledge learned
- Improved communication
- All librarians engaged with current/cutting edge/new issues as source for ongoing intellectual stimulation/growth
- Increased flexibility in assignments and areas people might specialize
- Cost savings(?)

VI. Potential risks:
- Time needed to develop expertise could vary by subject; if librarians have more subject responsibilities, could be problematic in developing expertise
- Librarians could be overloaded/overtaxed
- Reduces time for other primary responsibilities, less quality control
- Library as a whole is able to accomplish less since there is less FTE available.
- Unbalanced responsibilities and workload among librarians
- Not all librarians enjoy this type of work; not everyone will have ideas about areas of interest/priorities nor may feel comfortable as “leaders”
- Not every position needs this role. If we require it, could take time from other tasks.
- Difficulty in planning for issues that arise quickly
- Long-term planning with temporary librarians may be problematic

VII. Scope/Structure:
- How can this leadership role on topics/issues align with liaison role?
- Temporary librarians may not fit with emerging & evolving issues like OA, etc.
- Union issues with hiring temporary librarians
- Specialists (but not with Librarian job title) might be neglected
- What if we can’t afford the 25-30% time for these projects? Is 10% more do-able?
- Negotiation of assignments/issues would need to be worked out to ensure library/librarian had key priority issues covered, while remaining flexible as needs and issues arise/conclude/drift away
- Without distributing leadership for these types of broad issues, a fewer number of librarians will need to be responsible for the traditional functions/assignments
- Externally funded librarians have less flexibility on how work time can be spent on activities outside the contract/grant-funded services
- Discover cyberspace infrastructure (for Library/Organization)
- Digital preservation (for Library/Organization)

Management of a Library/Unit Role

Highlights of current environment:
- ~28 librarian-managers who oversee libraries/units; this represents ~40% of all recurring librarian positions (i.e. Acquisitions Dept, Cataloging Dept, Bancroft Technical Services, Doe/Moffitt Humanities & Social Sciences, Media Resources Center, Environmental Design Library, Optometry Library, Data Lab, East Asian Library)
- Several managers in other professional positions oversee libraries/units (i.e. Interlibrary Services, Doe/Moffitt Circulation Services, Newspaper/Microforms Library, Graduate Services/Morrison Library, and Biosciences Library)
- Managers have oversight ranging from 1-14 people (combinations of librarians and career staff)
- AUL for Public Services has 19 direct reports (including 14 subject specialty library heads)
- Librarians must supervise librarian positions; librarian-managers serve as their review initiators
- Some managers are responsible for stand-alone buildings, and some for units/libraries within other libraries or buildings
- Many managers are unaware where their unit’s policies diverge from library overall
- Many managers are unaware of implications of unit-specific policies for library overall
- Few managers have had training or support for their administrative/leadership responsibilities

Elements of the manager role (from the functions list) suggested as important roles for librarians:
- Unit/Library vision/goals and priority setting
- Alignment of unit/library work with the departments/groups the unit/library serves and the Library overall
- Initiate and oversee services/policies/improvements
- Responsiveness to faculty/user needs; in tune with the discipline/population
- Participation in meetings with relevant departments/centers/groups
- Focus on direction of the programs (perhaps separate from operations/facilities)
- Review initiator for librarian positions
- Lead and support all staff

Approach:

The Library is administratively reorganized into clusters or groupings (such as by subject affinities or geography) with a manager for each cluster or grouping. Manager positions have responsibility for oversight for a broader span of subjects and/or locations than they currently do, and their supervisory assignments are more equitable. With a greater number of staff reporting within the cluster, there is a larger community of people able to work together and ensure consistent operations (as in the case of absences). These positions are clearly identified as supervisors (e.g. non-represented). Management (unit/library vision, priorities, programmatic directions, personnel issues, communication, and relationship with other Library unit/libraries) would be a significant portion of their assignment, however these positions are likely to have some additional responsibilities as well (e.g. small liaison assignment, collection budget fund coordination for a domain, responsibility for library-wide leadership on an issue). The manager position would be professional position, either a librarian or other high level staff position (such as Manager 1). The Library would formalize approaches for better communication, training, and support for managers. Related operations manager, supervisor, and on-site workleader positions (permanent or roving) would need to be reviewed and more fully defined in relation to the Library Service Models.

[Alternative A: The managers are all high level staff positions, with librarians designated as domain leaders responsible primarily for reviews. Alternative B: The managers are all librarian positions, even in locations that may have a lower tier service level.]

Comments:

Motivation
- Units currently operate with great autonomy (customization) but great isolation (no existing community to call upon)

Potential benefits
- Builds upon some of what is already being done (librarian-managers over more than one library)
- Fewer managers with broader oversight may shift more authority from AUL to Manager level – responsibility/authority for key issues and the leadership of them is more broadly distributed
- Fewer librarian-managers free up more people and more time for other priorities/Frees subject librarians to focus on collection, reference, and instruction roles
- Knowledge that managers develop will have greater benefit to the library overall (once learn about an issue/procedure it can be useful to multiple locations/issues)
- Increased cross-training and professional skills sharing among librarians in a cluster/domain
- Excellent position to develop skills for AUL roles (succession planning for us or other libraries)
- Not everyone has managerial skills/aspirations – making explicit the focus on management means there would be a higher expectation for individuals to be effective managers
- If clustering resulted in shared supervisor positions (e.g., an operations manager for more than one unit) we could eliminate part-time/no benefits positions and have more staff in permanent jobs
- Greater consistency with staff reviews/feedback
- Increased flexibility to provide service during periods of librarian/staff illness or absence and assistance when demand rises
- May result in raising the standard of service or at least providing more consistency
- Create efficiencies among librarians and staff since there will be more consistency in procedures and narrower primary functions
- Maintain close relationships with academic departments

**Potential risks**

- Librarian-managers may lose their subject/domain expertise
- Coordination of communication between manager and selector (or whomever talks with department chairs/deans) could be more difficult and/or less timely
- Concern about loss of leadership if someone not present to deal with specific issues
- Oversight of numerous locations may lead to decreased responsiveness in any single location
- If units not managed by librarians may be loss of prestige, difficult to recruit liaison/selectors
- Increased number of librarians in unit would mean a greater number of cases to serve as review initiator and may interfere with other responsibilities
- Need to ensure sufficient backup in the system – if one person handles a function for 3 units then their absence may be too difficult to cover

**Scope/Structure**

- Clustering already exists with some units – get pros/cons from individuals that do these things to get input for improvement
- Group/cluster libraries by subject: science libraries, social sciences/humanities/special collections
- Aim for manageable roles -- neither too few nor too many direct reports
- Need to provide management training for manager; training for how to manage when not directly with people everyday
- Regardless of who manages a unit, it is essential that clear lines of authority/responsibility are drawn when organizational changes are made
- Define the manager, librarians, and staff jobs clearly and who's responsible for what
- Managers need to ensure regular meaningful feedback, provide good supervision and support, and encourage staff to experiment. Foster a culture of innovation within the organization.
- Could separate leadership for programmatic issues from management of operations/facilities
- Might shift some responsibilities to liaisons (exhibits, tours, orientations, donor cultivations, collection storage/weeding, prep for accreditation, contact with relevant campus groups/faculty/students/departments)
- Might shift some responsibilities to other staff (support for departmental seminar rooms/technology, troubleshoot equipment/facilities problems, SLE hiring/training, ensure website updated)
- Important to have someone close to the facility to know about “place” issues
- Roundtable and Subject Councils may be redesigned with slightly different purpose/membership; cluster meetings may fill part of the current role of Subject Councils
- Formerly had administrative assistants - perhaps could create such positions to support several groups
- Develop and/or improve training, cross training, and standardization (policies and procedures) within units
- Regular communication essential and need multiple channels
- What kind of staff and skills needed for each cluster? Web skills? Tech? Instruction? Subject expertise? Operations managers for day-to-day operations?
- How do unit processes get streamlined to make units easier to manage? (e.g. standardized SSL hours, standardized circulation rules, centralized processing, etc)
- Need adequate staff for units to function; not enough staff now to cover functions
  - May have to physically consolidate to get to sufficient staffing levels
  - Recentralize some unit functions
  - Make part-time positions full-time positions
  - Do we hire more people before beginning to divide people between units?
- Even if overall ownership of a function is removed, responsibility to the function still exists. When ownership is given, person must take on the responsibility.
- If librarian manages unit:
  - Librarians have knowledge of users and academic disciplines that allow them to readily address issues
  - Librarians have a broad understanding of future directions for library services to evolve (perhaps due to contact with peer institutions, professional conference participation)
  - Librarians are trusted by faculty based on their academic preparation
  - Manager role with responsibility for facilities/units as well as staff/librarians maintains connection between the departments/disciplines/users and visibility of the librarian
- If non-librarians manage unit:
  - More policy decisions and visioning might be pushed to AULs
  - Non-librarian managers spend more time on campus and are more accessible

Alternatives

- Physically consolidate smaller subject specialty libraries
- Consolidate location/branch/subject specialty if there is subject redundancies

Variables:
(What are the most important variables in making a decision about adopting this approach, or determining to what extent to implement it?)

[A future discussion will focus on this question after our initial discussion of all approaches]

Instruction Role

Highlights of current environment:
- For 2010-2011: course-related instruction (413 classes to 10,981 people), orientations (181 sessions to 3,205 people), training sessions (10 sessions to 93 people), and sessions for non-UCB people (38 to 668 people) – nearly 650 sessions to 15,000 people
- Course-related instruction is provided by librarians and LP4s, some other staff may support too.
- Currently there is unevenness of library instruction across departments – reasons vary.
- In this document "liaisons" includes liaisons to academic departments and academic support units, as well as subject librarians who work with library users.
- Most liaisons provide instruction to graduate students in their departments.
- Some liaisons provide instruction to undergraduate students in their departments; some liaisons do not teach any courses for undergraduate students (the other courses are generally picked up by staff in Doe/Moffitt Instruction and User Services unit (DMIUS)).
- DMIUS teaches most of the Reading & Composition courses and American Cultures designated courses (across all departments), as well as the general instruction such as for ED 98/198

- DMIUS handles library-wide instructional issues such as managing Library a la Carte, Library Guides, Library Tutorials site, Resources for Instructors wiki, Instruction Statistics database, e-readings support for instructors, GSI pedagogy classes, Summer Reading list, DM classrooms, etc

- DMIUS staff serve as liaisons to academic support units (ETS, Graduate Division, GSI Teaching and Resource Center, Office of Educational Development, Acad. Achievement Programs, etc)

- Many liaisons provide orientations and special sessions for external groups such as visiting Fulbright Scholars, teachers, high school/college prep students, special summer programs, etc.

- The Instructor Development Program is run by two co-chairs (appointed positions for 2yr term) and provides a forum and support network for library staff to improve their teaching skills.

**Elements of librarian role critical to consider:**

- A lot of people see this as a critical part of their liaison job. Undergraduate is as important as graduate, and they don't want to give that up.
- Lower division v. upper division
- Course related v. non-course-related
- Some non-course-related should be done by subject specialist
- What is the important liaison role?
- Why do we do it? Marketing our services, they may not know much about what libraries do, learn about citation and searching, save time by speaking to many students at once instead of singly on the desk.
- Could we train GSI’s to do a little library instruction?

**Approach A:**

Liaisons provide all course-related instruction (for graduate students and undergraduates – including Reading and Composition courses). Liaisons could be associated with broad disciplinary groups (such as humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, life sciences) to work together to identify programmatic needs and share responsibility for instruction so no one person is overburdened with meeting the needs of their department(s). A small library-wide instruction unit (perhaps 4 people) supports non-course specific instruction (such as for ED 98/198, L&S 1, Summer Sessions, general orientations and workshops) and library-wide instructional services such as managing Library a la Carte, library integration with bSpace, liaison roles with Office of Educational Development/Center for Teaching & Learning, and campus initiatives related to online education. Liaisons could draw upon other staff for instructional support which may report to the library-wide unit or disciplinary group.

**Motivation:**

- A community that can back up a librarian

**Scope/Structure:**

- Coordinator within each discipline to assign classes and divide workload
- Liaison can no longer hand off instruction to centralized staff.

**Approach B:**
Liaisons are responsible for all graduate orientations and instruction, undergraduate research methods courses, and undergraduate courses designated as first for a major. Liaisons could be associated with broad disciplinary groups (such as humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, life sciences) to work together to identify programmatic needs and share responsibility for instruction so no one person is overburdened with meeting the needs of their department(s). A library-wide instructional unit (perhaps about the size of the current Doe/Moffitt Instruction & User Services department with 7 FTE) is responsible for all other instruction including undergraduate general requirement courses (such as American Cultures and Reading & Composition), GSI pedagogy courses, and all non-course specific instruction (such as for ED 98/198, Summer Sessions, general orientations and workshops). The instructional unit includes administrative staff to support instruction spaces and instructional services.

**Reference Role**

**Highlights of current environment:**
- 15 libraries offer staffed reference desk hours currently; different number/range of hours (3 hrs/day to 8hrs/day to on-demand anytime)
- Some libraries have stand-alone reference desks; some libraries use the circulation desk as a point for connecting with users for reference questions
- Research Advisory Service in Doe/Moffitt allows undergrads to schedule 30-minute research consultation sessions; service is supported by student fee funding and must be continued
- Some libraries offer reference service by phone
- In this document “liaisons” includes liaisons to academic departments and academic support units, as well as subject librarians who work with library users.
- Most liaisons provide individual research consultations (via email or in-person)
- Some liaisons provide reference services outside the library (such as at Center, residence hall)
- Berkeley contributes a set number of hours to the UC-wide 24/7 chat reference service; staffing commitments must be continued (HOPS may request they be expanded)
- All libraries offer email addresses for reference assistance; Doe/Moffitt staffs the general “Ask a Reference Question” email reference service; special email sites are designed for government information, science libraries, and Bancroft
- Questions ebb and flow unpredictably throughout the day and semester
- Questions include directional, equipment troubleshooting, basic catalog searching, advanced catalog searching, general database searching, and subject-specific in-depth research
- More at [http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/Help/research_help.html](http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/Help/research_help.html)
Elements of librarian role critical to consider:
- Diverse information needs of users (general information, in-depth research consultation, course-related guide, etc.)
- Efficiency of librarians’ time
- Cooperation and communication between on-desk staff and liaisons/librarians
- Training staff/students at reference desk
- Reference models and quality control

Approach A:
Reference services are provided at physical reference desks with scheduled hours at a limited number of locations (locations carefully chosen to cover different disciplines and campus areas). The primary goal is to resolve as many reference questions at the desks as possible; referrals are made to liaisons and units as appropriate. Reference desk services may be provided at a separate desk or be offered from a portion of the circulation desk. Circulation desk staff at all locations are primary contacts for directional, informational, and catalog questions. [This approach might be explored with alternatives such as utilizing the full range positions that currently provide on-desk reference or exclusively providing on-desk reference with non-librarian staff who are skilled generalists.]

Motivation:
There are diverse information needs from users and on-desk reference service can create a user friendly environment. Reduced reference desks and hours can also be cost saving.

Potential benefits:
- Face-to-face reference is a fairly efficient way to do reference.
- It allows for interdisciplinary reference service in a merged desk model.
- Reduce librarian time spent on front-line reference desk services
- Gathering “critical mass” of users makes doing training for reference worthwhile.
- Communications between on-desk staff and liaison/librarians or units can be better fostered.
- Online reference questions can be reduced.
- Liaisons/librarians can focus on in-depth research consultation.

Potential risks:
- Public doesn’t know who is and is not a librarian, so poor service reflects poorly on us.
- We need an engaged staff who can analyze the reference service as it goes along.
- Different schedules of reference locations might be confusing to users.
- Not all general reference questions can be answered at the limited reference desks.

Scope/Structure:
- A small number of librarians will expand their role as coordinators to ensure service excellence and continuous improvements for reference
- It is necessary to training staff/students at reference desk basic and advanced reference skills (including advanced catalog searching and general database searching).
- Tiered reference model that includes electronic reference service already in effect in some libraries across the library more regularly.
- Kiosks will be supplementary to face-to-face general reference service.
- LAIV, LPIV or students can take on a role in general reference service
- Efficient referral process (including comprehensive referral list) needs to be reviewed.
- Information about locations that have physical reference desks and their schedules should be easy to find from library website.

**Approach B:**
Reference services are provided exclusively through online channels (such as general e-mail reference, 24/7 chat, and possible new kiosks with video links) and scheduled in-person individual consultations with liaisons. The Library no longer supports stand-alone reference desks or dedicated reference hours. Circulation desk staff are primary contacts for directional, informational, and catalog questions and refer all more advanced questions, reference questions, and resource questions to the online reference channels and/or liaisons/specialists. Online reference services may be supported by a range of library staff or provided exclusively by non-librarian staff who are skilled generalists. Individual consultations with liaisons (such as face-to-face or by email) will be emphasized as the primary method for research-intensive, subject-specific reference assistance.

Motivation:
This model can serve users where they mostly are and save librarians’ time for more subject-specific reference assistance.

Potential benefits:
- It responds to users’ needs more on a timely base.
- It is cost saving.
- Public service staff’s time can be saved to do shelf maintenance, circulation, etc.
- The library’s reference service model will be consistent and not confusing to users.
- Most questions can be answered by staff/generalists/students and subject librarians’ time can be saved.
- It can foster good communication between staff/generalists/students and subject librarians.

Potential risks:
- It might make librarians even more invisible that will underwrite our demise.
- Some questions are visual and may be difficult to capture in a chat reference.
- Staff/Students might be pressured by more training in remote reference/communication (including being familiar with referral list).
- It might discourage some users from asking questions/seeking help, or even coming to the library.
- Users might assume what they can get from the general online reference service is what they ask for; librarians might lose active role in reference service.
- Walk-in users might not feel the library environment friendly.

Scope/Structure:
- Invest in web infrastructure/remote reference in a coordinated way.
- Use Kiosks and online tutorials as alternative methods for general reference questions.
- Staff/generalists/students should be well trained for online reference service.

**Selector/Liaison Role**
Highlights of current environment:

- ~38 librarians/LP4s have both selection and liaison responsibilities, often covering multiple subjects/departments/specialties
- ~45 librarians/LP4s have selection responsibilities (~7 people are selectors without liaison role)
- Many selection assignments are aligned with liaison assignments to academic departments with faculty/lecturers and graduate students formally appointed/associated with that unit (e.g. Business, Comparative Literature, Engineering, German, Optometry, Political Science)
- Some selection assignments are aligned with liaison assignments to centers/institutes with faculty/graduate students affiliated (e.g. all area studies; some like African Studies and Latin American Studies do not have a separate academic dept, some like Chinese, Japanese, and Korean are all part of one dept)
- Some selection/curator assignments are not affiliated with a specific academic department or center (e.g. Data, Dutch, Finnish, Doe Reference, Federal Documents, General Science, International/Foreign Documents, Medieval Studies, Moffitt Reference, Moffitt Undergraduate Collection, Religious Studies (these managed by Doe/Moffitt); Pictorial Collections, Rare Books and Manuscripts, University Archives, Western Americana (these managed by Bancroft); Gifts and Exchange (managed by Acquisitions)
- Area studies selectors purchase materials published in the languages of the countries/regions within their scope; all other selectors have primary responsibility for purchasing materials of relevance for their disciplines/subjects; all selectors purchase items regardless of format and participate in UC-wide collections issues
- Selectors must stay abreast of, provide input about, and collaborate on a wide range of UCB and UC policies/practices for acquisitions, fund management, licensing, journal packages, approval plans, selection through catalogs/auctions, collaborative collection development, e-books, weeding, storage, etc.
- Many selectors negotiate purchases with other selectors (either for partial or total expense)
- All selectors/liaisons decide the best balance between electronic/print resources, and influence when possible a move by publishers and campus authors to open access publishing
- Collection areas are overlapping, somewhat roughly defined by call numbers for approval plans; several selectors are prompted to consider the same titles, other titles may be overlooked
- ~43 librarians/LP4s have liaison responsibilities (~5 people are liaisons without collection role)
- Currently liaison assignments span from one position with responsibility for 3 faculty+10 graduate students, to one position with responsibility for 108 faculty+812 graduate students
- Many liaison assignments are aligned with selection assignments (described above)
- Some liaison assignments do not have separate collection budgets (e.g. Ethnic Studies in Doe/Moffitt, Legal Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies, International & Area Studies, New Media)
- Some liaison assignments – mostly handled by Doe/Moffitt Instruction & User Services – are to academic support units (e.g. Academic Achievement Programs; American Cultures Center; Center for Transfer, College Writing, Re-entry and Student Parents; Disabled Students Program)

Assumptions/Constraints:

Campus has about 2,000 faculty/instructors and 10,000 grad students, and 26,000 undergrads
- with 60 librarians as liaisons averages are 33 faculty and 167 grads/librarian
- with 50 librarians as liaisons averages are 40 faculty and 200 grads/librarian
- with 40 librarians as liaisons averages are 50 faculty and 250 grads/librarian
- with 30 librarians as liaisons averages are 66 faculty and 333 grads/librarian
- with 20 librarians as liaisons averages are 100 faculty and 500 grads/librarian
Nearly all are either undeclared or declare multiple majors/minors. Rather than focus on undergrads by major, the Library should consider undergraduate enrollments in courses in each department and/or other ways of considering outreach to undergraduates.

If one continues to assume selection/reference/instruction go along with the liaison role, this means that the other librarian roles we choose to continue to emphasize (cataloging/processing, acquisitions, unit management, administration, new roles) would be the responsibility of the positions not included in the figure above. For example, if we assume 40 librarian roles for liaisons then we would have 10-30 librarian positions to assign to the other functions depending on the total number of librarians.

**Elements of selector/liaison roles where subject/domain expertise is most needed and most valuable:**

- Subject/Domain/Format knowledge to shape and manage collections
- Develop and maintain relationships with vendors/publishers
- Promote library services, collections, and resources to the campus community
- Manage collection development funds
- Provide intensive and personalized consultations (research support, collections goal development, etc)
- Engage with the scholarly community to promote library visibility
- Conduct user needs assessment and strategic planning
- Build relationships both within and outside the campus community
- Advocate for emerging academic and research paradigms
- Collaborate on special projects in conjunction with our patrons or outside partners
- Facilitate collaboration internally (for major acquisitions, projects, etc)
- Develop and cultivate external partnerships
- Engage in fundraising and development for collection support

**In light of the diverse needs and characteristics of Berkeley departments and patrons, a single approach may not suit all selection and liaison assignments.**

**Approach A:** Selector and liaison roles are integrated. All selectors have liaison assignments to academic departments and academic support units, and all liaison librarians have collection development assignments. Curator/collection assignments that are not associated with specific academic departments (i.e. government documents, rare books and manuscripts) are paired with responsibility for other liaison assignments which may or may not have a collection budget (i.e. Energy Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies). If there is no collection budget for the liaison assignment, the selector/liaison has a role in coordinating collaborative collection development among various selectors related to the field. All selector/liaison assignments include
responsibility for the full range of Liaison Role, Selection, Reference, and Instruction activities confirmed as a result of the re-envisioning process (current activities for consideration are outlined in the Functions List). Selection and liaison assignments will adjust so positions are more equitable overall (e.g., reducing the subject scope for the combined selection, liaison, reference, and instruction effort). Selector/liaisons would be further supported by being associated with and/or organized by disciplinary clusters or groupings (even if reporting lines are not formally handled that way), allowing individuals with related assignments to collaborate effectively. The relationship to the Reference and Instruction section of the Functions List would need to be further developed.

Comments:

Motivation:

- Currently, there are selectors without liaison assignments, liaisons without selection assignments, and librarians who serve both roles. An integrated role may distribute these responsibilities more equitably.
- When liaisons are not selectors, liaisons may have less influence in shaping collection development and services despite their intensive understanding of departmental and patron needs. And when selectors are not liaisons, collection development may not reflect the needs of patrons.

Potential Benefits:

- This approach is not so different from the current environment of many selectors and liaisons, so there are established practices and procedures to follow.
- Integrated selector-liaison roles may help fill any gaps resulting from librarian attrition and changes in other librarian roles (e.g., some librarians who may specialize as library managers).
- An integrated selection-liaison role may foster more equitable division of subject responsibilities.
- An integrated selection-liaison role promotes collection development that is more responsive to patron and department needs since these needs are identified during the liaison work.
- An integrated selector-liaison role will improve both our selection and liaison functions because they inform one other.

Potential Risks:

- If a liaison assignment does not include a collection budget, coordinating selection functions among related selectors could be very difficult.
- The selector-liaison may follow two separate reporting lines (to the respective library administrators for public services and for collections). This may be inefficient and may lead to conflict.
- Some selection assignments cover a broad range (like special collections and government documents), so it may be difficult to determine the appropriate liaison assignment scope.
- Ensuring the equitable division of selection-liaison assignments will be challenging. Departments can dramatically range in size widely, some collection responsibilities may include a wide range of departments (such as government documents and special collections), and some departments may be heavier library users than others.
- Many fields are interdisciplinary, so it is difficult to divide selector-liaison assignments into discrete parts.

Scope/Structure:

- The integrated selector-liaison role combines a variety of functions in order to provide targeted library collections and services to formal academic departments/entities. The combined responsibilities will include reference, instruction, liaison, outreach, and selection.
- As selector-liaison responsibilities are assigned, collection funds may need to be split or re-assigned to different groupings. It may be beneficial for every selector-liaison to have a collection development fund.
- The liaison roles require clear definitions and expectations because of the varying liaison philosophies and styles (e.g., proactive versus reactive) among librarians.
- Clear and documented collection development policies will improve selector functions.
- If librarians are responsible for more functions, there might be flexibility in work styles to accommodate (e.g., work from home for an afternoon).
- Variations on this approach
  o Selector-liaison functions may be assigned in different ways: (1) functions are shared among librarians and library staff; (2) functions are divided between librarians and library staff; and (3) functions are the sole responsibility of librarians. Further review could prioritize which selector-liaison functions are core tasks for librarians and which are suitable for library staff.
    ▪ If library staff assumes more selector-liaison functions, staff recruitment (e.g., LP4) may require subject expertise.
    ▪ If selector-liaison assignments are distributed across a team, this may allow the workload to be shared and possibly more equitable.
  o Library managers are responsible for liaison functions while subject librarians serve as selectors (e.g., EAL).
    ▪ Consequently, library managers could build a big picture understanding of faculty and department needs in order to effectively prioritize service and collection needs. However, the selector may lose direct communication with the department and rely on secondary channels for determining user needs.

Approach B: Selector and liaison roles are separated. The Library has a small number of selector positions and each position has a broad selection assignment (perhaps six positions, perhaps broad areas such as humanities, sciences, social sciences). The team of selectors consults frequently with subject/language/domain specialists (who have other primary assignments) to gather collection and collection management needs and recommendations, manage collection plans (such as cooperative collection arrangements, approval plan management, journal package reviews), manage/expend collection budgets, pilot/develop/inform new collection development and management approaches (such as patron driven acquisitions, shared print and shared-print-in place decisions, NRLF storage decisions), make all final decisions about purchases, and coordinate liaison librarians’ participation/efforts in collections initiatives. The subject/language/domain specialists who are not selectors have strong relationships with their associated selector(s) to suggest/inform purchases and have greater time to spend on other high value activities and issues (such as other current and new areas noted in the Functions List). The selector team members serve as collection budget fund coordinators and take a leadership role with all acquisitions- and collections-related issues regardless of subject, format, or provenance. The organizational relationship with the Acquisitions Department, licensing staff, and other related positions would be reviewed. The relationship between collection development and collection management (weeding, replacement, storage) and the positions with authority for those issues would need to be further refined.

Motivation:
- Time constraints prevent selectors from adequately serving as liaison and vice/versa; separating the roles would allow for more time to liaise and market the collections to the campus community while allowing selectors to focus on collection development.

Potential Benefits:
- When there are many selectors, collection development efforts may overlap (particularly with interdisciplinary fields); with fewer selectors, there could be less conflict.
- With broader subject responsibilities, selectors will have a larger collection budget and may develop a big picture perspective of collection needs. This could result in more efficient and comprehensive collection building.
- Selectors could specialize to cultivate their collection development expertise and be able to lead new collections initiatives and special projects.

Potential Risks:

- Difficult to identify selectors who have the wide subject and language expertise to collect for such broad domains and to understand the related departmental needs.
- Adds an extra step to the communication chain for collection requests (i.e., patron informs liaison, liaison informs selector, selector makes decision), consequently increasing the chance for miscommunication and misunderstandings between the selector and liaison.
- Requires procedures for clear communication between liaisons and selector and arbitration when there is conflict or disagreements over selector decisions.
- When collecting across broad subject areas, there is a potential for selector bias to particular subjects.
- Documenting and relaying patron needs to a selector may be difficult for liaisons.
- Tensions may arise when determining which library a purchased item will be assigned to.
- The complex terms and restrictions of the different budgets, external funding sources, and endowments may be difficult for fewer selectors to oversee and manage.
- Personality and other conflicts between the selector and liaisons may bias purchasing decisions.
- Selector and liaison roles are codependent, so separating them may weaken both functions.

Scope/Structure:

- This approach requires strong and clear communication channels between selectors and liaisons. Approaches and practices will need to be developed to ensure that everyone is heard, the communication is coordinated and efficient, and that there is mediation for conflicts in collection development interests.
- This approach may be more suitable for subject domains with high levels of interdisciplinarity or where purchasing is primarily through packages, YBP, or approval plans.

Approach C: Selector/liaisons have responsibility for subject/domain areas across multiple UC campuses, with other research libraries, and/or with external institutions (e.g. LBNL, CA Dept of Public Health). Based on a review of curricular needs, distinctions in research interests, trajectory for programs, and collections overlap studies, subject/domain areas would be identified as most eligible for cross-campus/institution assignments. The librarian would serve the faculty, students, and research interests of the associated campuses/institutions equally. The librarian might have Berkeley as his/her home base, or might be located at another partner campus. Faculty, graduate students, and leadership from all associated institutions would be involved in developing the service agreement. Specific details of the agreement between campuses outline the terms of service (such as if/how often visit other campuses in person; approaches for remote instruction/research consultation; financial/access arrangements for selection work; review/feedback from faculty, students, researchers and library colleagues). The arrangement would be reviewed on specific cycle (such as 3-5 years) to evaluate how well the approach works for the librarian as well as for the libraries and campuses involved and identify any adjustments needed.
Motivation:

- The Library has a history of successful external partnerships and collaborations (e.g., with Stanford, CA DPH, LBNL, UCSB for Slavic Collections).

Potential Benefits:

- From the Library’s experience with external partnerships, the initial set up may be a big project, but the ongoing work has been manageable and beneficial.
- If external partners pool their collection funds to a single selector-liaison, this may ensure money is efficiently spent while reducing duplication and building a more comprehensive collection.
- Partners may share resources to fill gaps in subject expertise and library services.

Potential Risks:

- Conflicts and rivalries may arise when determining access, location of materials, and services among the distributed partner sites.
- External partners may become heavily reliant on Berkeley’s collections and services and consequently reduce access by Berkeley patrons.
- The Library is already a complex system that may be further complicated when library collections and services are stretched across multiple institutions.
- External partnerships may increase the level of library processing work, which could require more staff time.

Scope/Structure:

- Other university libraries have adopted this approach (e.g., Columbia and Cornell).
- The existing collaborative relationships among UC campuses could potentially forge new library partnerships.
- New partnerships may require extensive adjustments to collection development policies and practices, fund allocations, budget management, and librarian professional review.
- This approach does not have broad applicability. It may be more successful for subjects/domains that (1) are relatively small in scope, (2) serve a small academic department, (3) rely heavily on electronic resources, or (4) lack librarians with the necessary subject expertise.
- For large partnerships, the selector-liaison functions may need to be distributed among a team to carry out. An important factor for success is a project manager who has the overall responsibility to see the big picture, to facilitate communication and workflow among the partners/stakeholders, and to ensure contractual obligations are met.
- Explore partners outside of UC (e.g. CSU, public libraries, private colleges, private sector) to make use of existing local expertise.
- Spend time at planning stage of joint/collaborative agreements to identify details, implications, implementation issues and avoid problems (such as increases in work/costs) later.

Acquisitions, Cataloging, & Special Collections Processing

Current Landscape

Technical service functions across the Library are largely centralized in a few locations. In addition to Library Collection Services which provides cataloging, acquisition, and serial services to most of the Library, there are 5 additional self-cataloging units (BANC, EAL, EART, MRC, MUSI), 3 self-acquisition (ordering and receiving) units (BANC, EAL, MUSI), and 17 serial receiving/check-in units (all subject
of the self-cataloging units, one focuses on specific languages, 3 on specific formats, and one is collection area specific.

The work of these units falls into one or more of the following categories:

- Print Ordering
- Original Monographic Cataloging
- Print Receiving
- Monographic Copy Cataloging
- Invoice Approval
- Serials Cataloging
- E-resource Ordering
- Manuscripts Cataloging
- E-resource Processing
- Pictorial & Collections Processing
- Serials Check-in
- Rare Book Cataloging
- Exchange Processing
- Electronic Collections Cataloging
- Gift Activities
- Recorded and Printed Music Cataloging
- Collections Intake
- Map Cataloging
- Motion Picture and Sound Recording Cataloging

In most cases original cataloging is done by librarians; copy cataloging is done by staff. Special collections processing is managed by librarians with processing assistance from staff. Acquisitions units are generally managed and run by staff, with the exception of Collection Services where an AUL and a librarian provide the highest levels of service (e.g. budget oversight) and department management. In the self-cataloging units focused on specific material types, original cataloging is performed by Library Professional 4s.

**Key Elements of the Librarian’s Role**
- Keep abreast of national trends, innovations, etc. in areas of expertise
- Interpret and apply national trends, innovations, and technologies to UCB environment as appropriate/desired
- Keep abreast of national, and system-wide cataloging standards and practices; interpret and implement locally
- Set local policy for cataloging, metadata, special collections, and acquisition practices
- Perform original cataloging: create metadata in MARC and non-MARC schemas (e.g. EAD, Dublin Core, etc.) in all languages and for all formats. Work with digital data and digital collection owners to determine needs for access and metadata
- Budget/Fund management
- Vendor relations
- Manage department: provide leadership, monitor productivity, track quality control, serve as a mentor and as an advocate for the Department’s staff
- Represent UC Berkeley in agreements/contracts with vendors and publishers
- Advocate and provide support for new methods of scholarly publishing
- Work with other UC campuses to create efficiencies, standards, best practices
- Work with partners (internal and external) to make use of/share unique expertise

**Approach A – Similar to Current Situation with Consolidation**

The heads of the Acquisition, the Catalog, and the Special Collections Processing departments are librarians. The complexity of an ever-changing professional landscape requires an ongoing commitment to the Information Science profession in order to maintain the currency and relevancy required to serve the needs of one of the largest (by volume and by budget) research libraries in the country.

Catalog librarians perform original cataloging in a specific language area, or where necessary, in a specific format area (e.g. rare books, manuscripts, etc.). UCB catalog librarians may catalog for other UC libraries. Catalog librarians collaborate with Library selectors who work in the same language areas to align collection use, treatment, and cataloging decisions.

In this approach, there is a single head for all Library acquisition units, and another for all the Library’s cataloging operations. Similarly, all Library units performing aspects of special collections processing would be consolidated under a single head. The Bancroft Library functions as the Library’s special and rare collections library (including management of ROHO, The Center for the Tebtunis Papyri, Mark Twain Papers, etc.)

Where it is economical and reasonable to do so, the physical operations of current self-cataloging, self-acquisition, and self-processing units would be absorbed into Collection Services or Special Collections Processing. Where it is not economical or reasonable to do so, remote units will have a managing librarian who reports to the Head Acquisition librarian, the Head Catalog librarian, or the Head Special Collections Processing librarian. The librarians responsible for remote cataloging units would serve as the “principal cataloger” for that unit, as well as unit manager. In the case of librarians responsible for remote acquisition units, the librarian would serve as the collections budget officer, as well as the unit manager. Similarly, librarians responsible for remote Archival Processing locations would serve as principal and supervisory archivist.

**Motivation:**
Collection Services has recently undergone an extensive re-organization, in part because of huge losses of librarians and staff. Approach A takes into account both the thought that went into that re-organization and the language and format areas that remain vacant.

**Pros:**
- The most up-to-date national standards are used
- Acquisition and serials functions are performed uniformly and consistently
- Librarians contribute catalog and authority records on a network level permitting UCB participation and leadership in national level cataloging forums.
- Centralizing management provides for: consistent departmental communication, better follow-through on goals and planning; multiple functional perspectives are brought together under a single organizational unit;

**Cons:**
- Some loss of local customization
- Unfamiliar org chart structure

**Approach B – Consolidation and Outsourcing**

Librarians serve as department heads for acquisitions, cataloging, and special collections processing. Principal catalogers, and principal archivists are also librarians. Acquisition budget officers, when needed, would also be librarians.

As it is in collection development, original catalogers with language and/or area expertise are also librarians. In some areas (e.g. English, marginal collection areas (e.g. Gaelic, Greek, etc.), or derivative formats (e.g. microforms, many electronic resources, etc.)) original cataloging may be done by well-qualified non-librarian professional staff.

In this approach, vendors who provide shelf-ready services are favored over those who don’t. Shelf-ready services are always used whenever available. This will reduce the number of student and copy catalogers required to sustain cataloging operations. Acquisition librarians would team with selectors to develop and implement an increased use of approval plans and other types of efficiencies.

All catalog and acquisition units including the East Asian Library and The Bancroft Library are consolidated with Collection Services. Librarians and archivists in Bancroft work only with material unique to Bancroft or to the Library (e.g. rare materials, manuscripts, pictorial collections, archival collections, etc.).

**Motivation:**
Focus outsourcing on materials which do not require original cataloging; allows catalogers (and special collection processing) to focus on materials unique to the collections.

**Pros:**
- Requires fewer permanent staff
- Allows staff with expertise to focus on those areas

**Cons:**
- Supports vendors instead of local workforce
- With loss of staff and their expertise, reverting to local operations would be a gargantuan effort (e.g. if outsourcing became too expensive, or unavailable)

**Approach C – Collaboration**

In addition to their local work, UCB librarians serve other UC campus libraries to catalog materials in areas unavailable by outsourcing or hiring (e.g. specific languages, or formats). Other UCs serve UCB in the same manner. Campuses may join together to hire catalog, or special collection processing librarians to serve several campuses’ needs in areas of expertise (e.g. formats or languages).

Depending upon Next Generation Technical Service outcomes, campuses may work together to develop cost-savings acquisition models (such as economies of scale when campuses band together, or large scale approval plans, etc.). Acquisition librarians at the various campuses would be responsible for negotiating and launching these programs.

**Motivation:**
UC Berkeley is not the only campus in the midst of a library service paradigm shift. All UC campus libraries are in need of thoughtful, effective, and cost saving ideas for providing services and resources to users.

**PROS:**

- Collaboration allows for shared expense and shared expertise
- Creates a stronger UC library system
- Local resources used to the fullest extent possible

**CONS:**

- Will have to wait for NGTS outcomes in order to proceed
- Possible imbalance of costs and benefits
- May not have sufficient input or control over services or negotiated contracts

**Approach D – Blended Scheme**

UCB units providing technical services may be consolidated into departments engaging in a broader enterprise. In these departments librarians serve as managers and Library leaders.

Principal catalogers and principal archivists are librarians. Original catalogers may be librarians or classified as library professional four. A balance of librarian and LP4 catalogers is necessary to maintain an understanding of and adherence to national standards. This balance is also necessary in order for UCB to participate in UC-wide and other initiatives where librarian participation is expected.

Librarians may collaborate with other UC campuses to share collection services resources, although the work detailed within these agreements may be performed by staff at other levels, as appropriate.

Librarians are also responsible for identifying, coordinating, and evaluating shelf-ready outsourcing contracts.

**Motivation:**

In this environment there is no single solution to providing the multitude of technical services without making major changes. However, change in one area is bound to effect services in another. This approach allows for making changes in staffing, services, and organizational units over a period of time in order to reach a functional balance.

**Literature Reviewed:**


Appendix G. Open Meeting Summary

An Open Meeting was held March 5, 2012. All interested staff were invited. Attendees discussed select potential approaches to various librarian roles, and provided valuable feedback to inform the priorities and processes for each of these roles. Notes from that meeting appear below in three sections: Approaches for Discussion (selected options from the Overviews), Comments about “Exploring Priorities” and Comments about “Exploring Approaches.”

Section 1: Approaches for Discussion

We’ve had a short time to identify approaches for discussion. Inclusion on the list does not mean that the approach is being endorsed but that we want your comments to inform us as we explore it. The team welcomes suggestions for other approaches – please write those on the index cards at your table.

CATALOGING

Catalogers, selectors, and/or liaisons have responsibility for subject/domain/language areas across multiple UC campuses, with other research libraries, and/or with external institutions (e.g. LBNL, CA Dept of Public Health). This person might have Berkeley as his/her home base or might be located at another partner campus, and serves the interests of the associated campuses/institutions equally. Library administration, faculty, graduate students, and leadership from all associated institutions would be involved in developing the service agreement. Specific details of the agreement between campuses outline the terms of service (such as if/how often visit other campuses in person, approaches for remote service, financial/access arrangements for selection/cataloging work). The arrangement would be reviewed on a specific cycle (such as 3-5 years) to evaluate how well the approach works for the individual as well as for the libraries/institutions involved and identify any adjustments needed. [This approach might be explored for other functions such as selection, reference, or instruction as well.]

COLLECTIONS/LIAISON (1)

All selector/liaison roles are integrated – each person is responsible for collection development, collection management, outreach, reference, and instruction for their assigned departments and areas. Curator/collection assignments that are not associated with specific academic departments (i.e. government documents, rare books and manuscripts) are paired with responsibility for other liaison assignments which may or may not have a collection budget (i.e. Ethnic Studies, Energy Studies, Interdisciplinary Studies). Selection and liaison assignments are adjusted to be more evenly distributed. Selector/liaisons would be associated with disciplinary clusters or groupings (even if reporting lines are not formally handled that way), allowing individuals with related assignments to collaborate effectively.

COLLECTIONS/LIAISON (2)

Selector (collection development/management) and liaison (outreach, reference, instruction) roles are separated. There are a small number of selector positions, each responsible for a broad disciplinary area (such as humanities, sciences, social sciences) and for coordinating with the subject/language/domain specialists who serve as liaisons working with academic departments, programs, centers, researchers, and students. The selectors consult frequently with the liaisons to develop a broad, shared, equitable vision for collections, manage collection plans (such as approval plans, cooperative agreements, WEST titles), manage/expend collection budgets, develop/inform new collection development/management approaches (such as patron driven acquisitions, shared-print-in place decisions), and make all final decisions about purchases. The selectors serve as collection budget fund coordinators and the communication may take place in meetings that are similar to our current subject councils.
INSTRUCTION (1)

Liaisons provide all course-related instruction (for graduate students and undergraduates – including Reading and Composition courses). Liaisons could be associated with broad disciplinary groups (such as humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, life sciences) to work together to identify programmatic needs and share responsibility for instruction so no one person is overburdened with meeting the needs of their department(s). A small library-wide instruction unit supports non-course specific instruction (such as for ED 98/198, L&S 1, Summer Sessions, URAP, general orientations and workshops). Liaisons could draw upon other staff for instructional support which may report to the library-wide unit or disciplinary group.

INSTRUCTION (2)

Liaisons are responsible for all graduate orientations and instruction, undergraduate research methods courses, and undergraduate courses designated as first for a major. Liaisons could be associated with broad disciplinary groups (such as humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, life sciences) to work together to identify programmatic needs and share responsibility for instruction so no one person is overburdened with meeting the needs of their department(s). A library-wide instructional unit is responsible for undergraduate general requirement courses (such as American Cultures and Reading & Composition) and all non-course specific instruction (such as for ED 98/198, Summer Sessions, URAP, general orientations and workshops). The instructional unit would have administrative staff to support instruction spaces and instructional services.

REFERENCE/INFORMATION (1)

Reference services are provided at physical reference desks with scheduled hours at a limited number of locations (locations carefully chosen to cover different disciplines and campus areas). The primary goal is to resolve as many reference questions at the desks as possible; referrals are made to liaisons and units as appropriate. Reference desk services may be provided at a separate desk or be offered from a portion of the circulation desk. Circulation desk staff at all locations are primary contacts for directional, informational, and catalog questions. [This approach might be explored with alternatives such as utilizing the full range positions that currently provide on-desk reference or exclusively providing on-desk reference with non-librarian staff who are skilled generalists.]

REFERENCE/INFORMATION (2)

Reference services are provided exclusively through online channels (such as general e-mail reference, 24/7 chat, and possible new kiosks with video links) and in-person individual consultations with liaisons. The Library no longer supports stand-alone reference desks. Circulation desk staff are primary contacts for directional, informational, and catalog questions and refer all more advanced questions, reference questions, and resource questions to the online reference channels and/or liaisons/specialists. Online reference services may be supported by a range of library staff or provided exclusively by non-librarian staff who are skilled generalists. Individual consultations with liaisons (such as face-to-face or by email) will be emphasized as the primary method for research-intensive, subject-specific reference assistance.

UNIT MANAGEMENT / OPERATIONS

The Library is administratively reorganized into clusters or groupings (such as by subject affinities or geography) with a manager for each cluster. Manager positions have responsibility for oversight for a broader span of subjects and/or locations than they currently do, and their supervisory assignments are more equitable. Management (unit/library vision, priorities, programmatic directions, personnel issues, communication, and relationship with other Library unit/libraries) would be a significant portion of their assignment, however these positions are likely to have some additional responsibilities as well. Related operations manager, supervisor, and
on-site workleader positions (permanent or roving) would need to be reviewed and more fully defined in relation to the Library Service Models.

**Section 2: Comments about “Exploring Priorities” questions**

The room was arranged with tables assigned to focus on a specific function (Cataloging, Collections/Liaison, Instruction, Reference, Unit Management). Participants were asked to sit at a table with a function that interested them. Then they were asked: “What changes would you recommend if the Library had 25% less time (meaning 25% less people) to address the function assigned to your table?”

- What should the Library improve/do more efficiently?
- What should the Library add/start doing?
- What should the Library give up/stop doing?

Some suggestions for a function came from participants at another table and are noted as such.

**Cataloging**

**Improve**

- More training, including focusing on RDA
- Outsource all or as much as possible via a single flow
- Focus on cataloging electronic material
- Focus efforts on rare and unique items in the collections/at Berkeley
- Improve interdepartmental communication within the Library (for Library/Organization)
- Consolidate cataloging/fewer self-cataloging areas
- Consolidate technical processing and/or cataloging units
- Consolidate cataloging into central technical services
- Have certain campuses responsible for particular languages/areas then make use of copy cataloging at other locations
- Get more subject specialists
- Use selectors more to help with subject headings and other information for records
- Hire more catalogers
- Hiring catalogers/processors who have language expertise for materials being collected
- Hiring catalogers that provide expertise across cataloging units (e.g. SPA catalogers to do MAIN, SSL, BANC etc)
- Consider cataloging and physical processing as part of the collections process therefore to be budgeted as part of the collections budget

**Start**

- Implement BIBCO standard record (or even more minimal) for all print
- Joint cataloging projects with other UCs focusing on language and/or format strengths
- More sharing
- Bring back idea of catalogers working at public desks
• Consolidate check-in across campus by large subject area, have roaming staff from subject specialty libraries
• Use cataloger expertise for UCB unique collections instead of staff that can be outsourced
• Shelf ready services for cataloging (from Unit Management)

Stop

• Binding so many MAIN serials, especially inactive titles
• Rigorous adherence to descriptive standards
• No NACO/BIBCO
• Acquiring materials in languages we can no longer process or catalog
• Collecting science journals in print whenever possible
• Direct receipt of journals at unit level (from Unit Management)
• Technical services work at unit level (from Unit Management)
• Print serials (from Unit Management)
• Classifying (from Collections)
• Cataloging serials (rely on SFX and UC e-links) (from Collections)

Instruction

Improve

• Peer-to-peer exchange of instruction resources/instructor development for graduate level
• Educate patrons on use of electronic resources. Many don’t realize that many resources are available full text (both books and articles). Wasted resources if people don’t use them. (from Unit Management)
• Improve online library orientation with video guides/tutorials (from Reference)
• Liaison relationships with academic departments (e.g. raise awareness of the need for undergraduate and graduate instruction) (from Collections)

Start

• Better coordination of instruction programs (i.e. RefWorks)
• Standardize assessment of effectiveness (i.e. survey students and faculty members)
• Require statistics from all instructors
• Have undergraduates take library skills requirement, would give them better library skills and keep staff/librarians from having to educate them on individual basis as frequently (from Unit Management)

Stop

• No longer use non-standard instruction software

Unit Management/Operations

Improve

• Statistics and size table reporting
• Signage/leaflets (when/where go for service)
• 24/7 chat (how is it working, when is it mostly used) (for Reference)
• Millennium tasks handled at unit level – too time consuming
• Supervisory skills; fewer supervisors overseeing more employees allows them to focus on this role more
• Setting goals for Library and for unit
• Providing coordinated/centralized training
• Educate patrons on use of electronic resources. Many don’t realize that many resources are available full text (both books and articles). Wasted resources if people don’t use them. (for Instruction)
• Efficiency
• Set up priority between print and non-print based on the information landscape and different needs of academic disciplines (for Collections)
• Grouping of libraries (?) science library, social sciences/humanities/special collections

Start

• Gather data and assessment in a coordinated, planned way
• Centralize NRLF processing (perhaps with roving team)
• Develop career paths for clear paths for staff advancement
• Management training; managers get it ad hoc, learn by doing now
• Liaison/subject/academic specialties
• Have undergraduates take library skills requirement, would give them better library skills and keep staff/librarians from having to educate them on individual basis as frequently (for Instruction)
• Instruction and come out to desks (for Reference)
• Discover and cyberspace infrastructure (for Library/Organization)
• Digital preservation (for Library/Organization)
• Shelf ready services for cataloging (for Cataloging)

Stop

• Taking statistics manually for anything that can be drawn from Millennium
• Routine tasks; or delegate more effectively
• Direct receipt of journals at unit level (for Cataloging)
• Technical services work at unit level (for Cataloging)
• Print serials (for Cataloging)
• Stop doing anything that is not used effectively (e.g. annual reports), or use them effectively
• Location/branch/subject specialty consolidated particularly if there is subject redundancy

Reference

Improve

• Regular effective assessment of all services and resources
• Offer additional one-on-one reference service with librarians
• Evaluate practices to determine streamlining (hard to know improvements without details)
• Tiered structure across libraries
• Not all clients are going to appreciate or use e-correspondence, need diverse channels and face-to-face
• Electronic reserve support
• Improve online library orientation with video guides/tutorials (for Instruction)
• Training and documentation of new procedures
• Improve signage
• Reassess library web resources, particularly use of ERF (do we know what users need or want?)
• Use of SLEs to triage information requests to reference interviews
• More efficient reserves (we put so many on that get little use)
• More effective, broader use of electronic reference
• Participate in e-reference
• Training programs for students/LA on front lines
• Supporting internal candidates/overall training for all roles in the Library (for Library/Organization)
• Make better use of grad student employees (tuition remission etc) (for Library Organization)
• Online services such as chat reference
• Easier to locate information on our web pages
• Referrals from reference desks to subject specialty librarians
• Training for staff to create online tutorials/guides
• Look for other opportunities where reference staff are working together
• Start more virtual/online
• Pave the cow paths approach
• Group format services together such as government info, geospatial, data – even if it is just a virtual center
• For foreseeable future a form of brick and click model may work best. Brick: where? Now 15 libraries, libraries with selectors/specialists coordinating with circulation desk/staff physically, reference and information triage for where the public is. Click: what format? How/who coordinate, integrate with physical collections, coordinate with librarians/subject specialists
• Better instructions for library resources for people to be self-sufficient/self help
• Improve training for staff/students at information/reference desks
• Referrals to approach staff/libraries/units
• More cooperation among librarians/specialists
• Use library interns/students to do some of information work
• Cross train reference staff across disciplines (such as among science librarians)
• More and better 24/7 chat reference
• Better point of need help on e-resources (how to export citations, info within the web interface)
• Distinguish between technical help and reference help
• Public access: better definition of policy for the public, how much reference help
• Address printing/guest card issues
• 24/7 chat (how is it working, when is it mostly used) (from Unit Management)
• Make reference points more visible (from Collections)
• Systems should handle technical services issues, not ill-prepared reference staff (from Collections)

Start

• Experiment with tiered reference
• Staff reference desks with library professionals
• Reconfigure Doe so reference collection and Stacks are integrated
• Digital initiatives “department” directed by librarians
• Using interns from San Jose State library school
• Online tutorials for instruction/reference
• Partner with other UCs and research university libraries
• Self checkout
• Expand data services across the disciplines
• Unified web sites
• Add reference services to Doe Stacks
• Better train students at information/circulation desks to either refer or answer questions
• Expand Research Advisory Service (RAS)
• Clearer/better explained circulation information online
• Wisconsin-Ohio Reference Education Program (WOREP); John Shepard heard encouraging reports about this program
• More computer support like offered in computer labs (we get asked, so why not enhance our services)
• Non-staffed study rooms (possibly accessible 24 hours)
• Information kiosks in all libraries for basic information
• Honor experience and institutional memory of those retiring after decades at the Library; have them train and pass on their knowledge
• Train student employees to handle basic information functions
• Provide reference by appointment only
• Start paging system for libraries with GA staffing desks
• More cross disciplinary reference staff; reference staff should not be tied to a unit
• Provide on call reference to reduce time needed at service desks
• Encourage other non-librarian public services staff to do some reference/information services (directional, troubleshooting, database searching)
• Encourage cataloging staff to provide some reference services
• Use as much virtual service as possible
• Instruction and come out to desks (from Unit Management)
• Enable the entire staff with the ability to answer basic reference questions (from Collections)

Stop

• Desk reference
• Staffing reference desks with librarians
• Reactionary combination of services
• Eliminate classical reference desk function; establish information desks for directional, informational, general information service with student employees
• Allowing staffing inequities across libraries
• Offering reference to the general public
• Staffing so many distinct reference desks
• Manned reference desks
• Need to spend less of reference staff time helping with PC, copier, scanner issues
• Give up scheduling in-person reference hours in selected units
• Staffing some of the many service desks
• Individual reference desks
• General reference as exists (see start paging suggestion)
• Some reference sites can be removed/grouped
• Librarians don’t have to answer all reference questions

Collections/Liaison

Improve

• Opportunities to work with donors
• Streamline personnel review process (for Library/Organization)
• Shelf reading
• Systems should handle technical services issues, not ill-prepared reference staff (for Reference)
• Automate book checkout
• Merge some collections (branch libraries) as service points – don’t stop the collections though
- Liaison relationships with academic departments (e.g. raise awareness of the need for undergraduate and graduate instruction) (for Instruction)
- Collaborative collection development
- Relations with similar collections in Bay Area and US
- Make reference points more visible (for Reference)
- Set up priority between print and non-print based on the information landscape and different needs of academic disciplines (for Collections)

**Start**

- Cooperative selection with other UCs
- Start making faculty aware of RLF space crisis
- Enable the entire staff with the ability to answer basic reference questions (for Reference)
- More comprehensive digitization program
- Start using ILL credits to bind books
- Start firm ordering e-books
- Better communication with selectors
- All selector meetings include representation from all libraries
- Start ordering directly from vendors
- Start an out of print ordering division
- Set up approval plans for various categories of library materials to free up selectors time for liaison work and other duties
- Circulate media via ILL and RLCP

**Stop**

- Replying to CDL lists with one day notice
- Wasting time with CDL initiatives
- Classifying (for Cataloging)
- Cataloging serials (rely on SFX and UC e-links) (for Cataloging)
- Stop doing collection development principally by means of individual firm orders
- No separate Moffitt/undergraduate collection and service point
- Going through endless spreadsheets to select for storage (Doe)
- Devoting time to replacing “missing” pages for monographs
- Writing as many reports
- So many meetings
- Selector annual reports
- Liaison to departments

**Library/Organizational Ideas**

**Improve**

- Improve interdepartmental communication within the Library (from Cataloging)
- Streamline personnel review process (from Collections)
- Supporting internal candidates/overall training for all roles in the Library (from Reference)
- Make better use of grad student employees (tuition remission etc) (from Reference)
- Discovery and cyberspace infrastructure (from Unit Management)
- Digital preservation (from Unit Management)

Section 3: Comments about “Exploring Approaches” document
The room was arranged with tables assigned to focus on a specific function (Cataloging, Collections/Liaison, Instruction, Reference, and Unit Management). Participants were given a document with a series of possible approaches. They were asked to consider one approach and discuss:
  o What are further refinements/clarifications for this approach?
  o What are good elements of this approach?
  o What could be an improvement or alternative to the approach?

**Cataloging - Approach**

**Good elements**
- Focuses on sharing language/subject/format expertise

**Refinements**
- Explore partners outside of UC (e.g. CSU, public libraries, private colleges, private sector) to make use of existing local expertise
- Improve technology so being present at location of material isn't necessary (e.g. mass digitization)
- Spend more time at planning stage of joint/collaborative agreements to identify details, implications, implementation issues and avoid problems (such as increases in work/costs) later
- Liaison role might need to be campus specific
- For unique collections/formats and rare books you need to see/handle the unique item; would require much travel place to place; need a strategy for this.
- For general subject materials, assess who should take responsibility
- Coordinate cataloging/collection building across campuses; eliminate collections on campuses where they are not needed.

**Alternatives**
- Receive material at the location that has expertise
- Let curriculum/academic departments direct and refine our collection; collect more narrowly and focus catalog expertise to support those areas
- Outsourcing or temporary hires to process/catalog portions of special collections/languages
- Extend concept from shared staff person to a centralized shared facility for problematic obsolete media: one center stores AV or magnetic media and digitizes for distribution to users anywhere (and for preservation).
- Narrow approach focusing on sharing language expertise only

**Unit Management/Operations – Approach**

**Good elements**
- This approach is process or service oriented; it creates synergy; if implemented wisely it can lead to economies of scale and efficiency.
- Could provide more backup among units within the cluster
- Utilizing staff efficiently to assist one another – cross-training
- If clustering resulted in shared supervisor positions (an operations manager for more than one unit) we could eliminate part-time/no benefits positions and have more staff in permanent jobs
- May result in raising the standard of service, or at least providing more consistency
- Builds upon some of what is already being done (librarian-managers over more than one library)
• Still have close relationships with academic departments
• Frees subject librarians to focus on collection, reference, and instruction roles
• Improved management/supervisory skills because focus on that task (rather than one of many)

Refinements

• Define the job clearly, create adequate support and encourage staff to experiment – foster a culture of innovation within the organization
• Few enough locations to have manager focused on management/supervision for each unit
• Need to ensure sufficient backup in the system – if one person handles a function for 3 units then their absence may be too difficult to cover
• Need adequate staff for units to function; may have to physically consolidate to get to sufficient staffing levels
• Clustering already exists with some units – get pros/cons from individuals that do these things to get input for improvement
• Do we hire some more people before beginning to divide people between units? It seems we don’t have enough staff to divide up to cover what we have now
• What kind of staff and skills needed for each cluster? Web skills? Tech? Instruction? Subject expertise?
• Make part-time positions full-time positions
• Day to day operations have to be managed by staff
• Improve training, cross training, and standardization (policies and procedures) within units
• Remove ownership, not responsibility – give ownership and take on responsibility
• Communication
• How do unit processes get streamlined to make units easier to manage? (e.g. standardized SSL hours, standardized circulation rules, centralized processing, etc)
• Needs training and better communication channels

Alternatives

• Physically consolidate smaller subject specialty libraries – huge endeavor!

Instruction – Approach (1)

Good Elements

• Sharing expertise
• Backups available from the disciplines (area studies can be backup for history for example)
• Broader view of library instruction in specific discipline
• Improves librarian and faculty relationships in departments

Refinements

• Require liaisons who do not do instruction to do instruction or refer it
• Some baseline instruction required of everyone
• Coordination of instruction
• Small unit continues to coordinate
• Staff would coordinate requests, etc
• Staff subject experts (beyond librarians) can provide instruction
• Some mechanism for keeping instructional components coordinated, consistent, etc

Alternatives
• Improve online instruction as supplement to in-person instruction
• Create larger instruction unit to do instruction
• Not have central teaching unit and have liaisons do all instruction
• Teach larger groups

Collections/Liaison (1)

Good elements

• An integrated selector-liaison role will improve both our selection and liaison functions because they inform one other.
• Providing reference services will improve a librarian’s selection functions.

Concerns

• Difficult to appoint liaison assignments equitably because patron segments may use the library differently (e.g., some disciplines have heavy library users).
• Many fields are interdisciplinary, so it is difficult to divide selector-liaison assignments into discrete parts.
• Rare books selectors may collect across a wide range of disciplines, so liaison assignments may be unclear.

Improvements/Alternatives

• The liaison roles require clear definitions and expectations because of the varying liaison philosophies and styles (e.g., proactive versus reactive) among librarians.
• Every selector-liaison assignment should have a collection development fund or have its funds increased.
• Clear and documented collection development policies will improve selector-liaison functions.
• Fundraising and gaining community support are important for the selector-liaison role.
• Central funds should be used to seed the underfunded selection assignments.
• If librarians are responsible for more functions, there should be flexibility in work styles to accommodate (e.g., work from home).
• There are many different disciplines, so a one-size-fits-all approach may not be feasible.
• If selector-liaison assignments are distributed across a team, this may allow the workload to be shared and possibly more equitable.
• Subject expertise is critical for selector-liaison assignments.

Collections/Liaison (2)

Good elements

• With fewer selectors, the remaining selectors will be able to develop a broader view of the collections and may be able to identify and target collection gaps.
• Currently, there are too many selectors (e.g., area studies).

Concerns

• Broad domain responsibility for collection development is very difficult
• Selector and liaison roles are codependent, so separating them may weaken both functions
  • If you separate selection functions from liaison functions, you may hamper the ability to help our patrons.
o Can’t be a good collection development librarian, without liaison interactions.

- Are there enough generalists to be broad domain selectors?
- This approach does not provide selectors with opportunities for engaging faculty and students.
- Adds another layer of meetings and communication that can be difficult. However, Area Studies already has experience with this separate layer of selector and liaison roles.

**Improvement/Alternatives**

- The selector will need a strong and open presence with liaisons to foster good communication of collection needs.

**Reference (1)**

**Good elements**

- Real-time, in-person reference interview has value

**Refinements**

- Cannot be exclusively at reference desk
- Referral process needs to be reviewed (referral process, units, etc)

**Alternatives**

- On call or by appointment approach

**Reference (2)**

**Good elements**

- Meets users in their environment; online is what students ask for; it is where many users are
- Long distance learners
- Just in time reference
- Tiered/Triage structure is good
- Could save librarian time
- Kiosks could address many questions arising from poor signage, etc
- Helps dismantle reference desks

**Refinements**

- Spreading the word will be critical
- Funnel information gathered to improving web site, tutorials, etc
- Enhance library home page and branch pages with video orientation and basic reference instruction (e.g. how to use OskiCat)
- More options than QuestionPoint System (we need face-to-face, video, etc)
- Embed access to reference service in bSpace
- Focus on UC patrons
- Is proximity to collection itself of value? Circulation staff are not close…
- Needs big investment in ongoing training and oversight of circulation staff/students
- Stress training for circulation desk staff in order to correctly refer research-intensive questions
- Circulation staff have nearby backup for reference questions needing more immediate attention
- Self checkout
- Circulation staff handling directional questions – is there funding for additional GA that is required?
• Need a liaison circle with a streamlined appointment structure
• Make it easier to find subject specialists on the web site
• Further training for circulation staff/students to understand nuances of catalog searching
• Need assessment of reference use and need before any model is put in place

Alternatives

• Emphasize use of social networking sites and popular student online tools (e.g. Facebook)
• Expand online presence
• Online one-on-one appointment service
• Discussion Board for collecting ideas and debate for reference groups and topics
• Ongoing proactive PR for library services. Students and faculty don’t know what we are doing
• More food and coffee and retail
• Gift shop
• Self checkout and one reference type person who can handle circulation and catalog problems
• Instruction sessions for students and staff to make knowledge consistently
• A way to even triage questions so non-reference can be handled elsewhere
Appendix H. Librarian Staffing – Estimations of Effort by Function

Librarian FTE Estimations for Primary Roles --
Current

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Selection/Liaison</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>Cataloging/Acquisitions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager - Public Service</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager - Domain Areas</td>
<td>50% in domain</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager - Domain Areas</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Cataloging/Acquisitions)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging/Archiving/</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions Only</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference/Instruction</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection/Liaison/</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction/Reference</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFORT TOTAL</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian FTE Estimations for Primary Roles -- Recommended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager - Public Service</strong></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Selection/Liaison</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Cataloging/Acquisitions</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manager - Domain Areas</strong></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Selection/Liaison</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Cataloging/Acquisitions</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% in domain (varies)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cataloging/Archiving/Acquisitions Focus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction Focus</strong></td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Selection/Liaison</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>Cataloging/Acquisitions</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection/Liaison/Instruction/Reference</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFORT TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>