
Factors for Success: Academic Library Development Survey Results

IRENE M. HOFFMAN, AMY SMITH, AND LESLIE DiBONA

ABSTRACT

LIBRARY ADVANCEMENT HAS BECOME A NEW AREA of need and specialization in academic libraries of all types. The results of a nationwide survey (see Appendix) provide information on this new trend and bring a better understanding of how academic library fund-raising programs are structured. The survey results are used to identify characteristics and elements of the fund-raising program that lead to success. The results also provide suggestions and items for consideration to assist library directors in their planning of new library advancement programs.

INTRODUCTION

Academic libraries have become active players in the fund-raising game. Over the past three years, we have witnessed a tremendous growth in fund-raising activities across the United States and Canada. Indicators of this trend include the growth of library fund-raising groups such as ALADN (the Academic Library Advancement and Development Network), the emergence of library fund-raising listservs such as LIBDEV, and a steady increase in the number of publications and presentations on fund-raising. As Charles Kratz (1998), 1997/98 president of ALA's Library Administration and Management Association, stated: "For some time now, libraries have been confronted by the reality of budgetary restrictions and the

Irene M. Hoffman, Robert E. Kennedy Library, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, CA 93407

Amy Smith, Development Office, College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521

Leslie DiBona, Development Office, Library and Information Access, San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182

LIBRARY TRENDS, Vol. 48, No. 3, Winter 2000, pp. 540-559

© 2000 The Board of Trustees, University of Illinois

spiraling cost of library materials and services. One perplexing aspect of this reality is that it will not go away This has made fund-raising an increasingly essential function for library leaders and managers" (p. 196).

Internally within the California State University system, we also noted some significant signals that fund-raising was becoming a library priority. Our first indication that a dramatic change was taking place within the profession was in our own institution. The California State University Libraries Strategic Plan (1994) states:

[W]orking in collaboration with their campus constituencies, [library directors will] identify and develop campus-specific targets of opportunity for fund-raising and staff-funding initiatives. The CSU should take the lead role in developing a new model for State funding of operations and capital needs of libraries. The library of the 21st Century will be integrated inexorably with academic programs and technical service providers, making traditional funding paradigms obsolete. (pp. 43-44)

Today, seventeen of the twenty-three CSU campus libraries have a fund-raising program in place.

This emerging area of specialization has many implications. The two most critical are the skill set that will be required for library directors and the education and professional training that will be necessary to properly educate and prepare new professionals for this task.

This growing trend in academic library fund-raising was the catalyst for this study. As we noted this dramatic trend among ourselves, we began to wonder if what was happening within the CSU was in some way indicative of a larger trend among libraries nationally. Was fund-raising becoming a more prominent priority for other academic libraries? What was the professional background of the fund-raising staff? How much money was being committed to the fund-raising effort, and how much was being raised? We were curious to hear more about fund-raising successes in libraries as well as the makeup of their donor pool.

ABOUT THE SURVEY

The concept of the survey began with the hypothesis that fund-raising was becoming increasingly more prevalent throughout the academic library community. We wanted to learn more about the types of institutions engaged in fund-raising, the educational and professional background of development directors, and how these individuals are classified and compensated. We were also curious to learn how other libraries have progressed, what fund-raising programs were used and were successful and, finally, how we could begin to create a profile for success that could be beneficial for library administrators seeking to establish fund-raising programs. The goal of the survey was to gain a better understanding of the trends within academic library fund-raising and to determine benchmark

information that could be used in establishing library fund-raising programs in the future.

In 1996, the three authors, all from CSU campuses at the time, began work on the Academic Library Development Survey. The survey instrument was constructed to obtain information in three major areas:

1. Who is doing the fund-raising?
2. What is actually occurring in these fund-raising programs: how are they managed, how much do they raise, what are the funding priorities, and what programs seem to work?
3. What are the factors that help determine success?

After the survey instrument was completed (see Appendix), a decision on how to distribute it had to be made. Since there exists no formal listing of libraries engaged in fund-raising, the best approach for distribution was to utilize appropriate listservs. We selected listservs from ALADN (LIBDEV); Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL-Forum); Library Administration and Management Association, Fund-raising and Financial Development Section (LAMA-FRFDS); and California Academic & Research Libraries (CARL). However, due to the nature of listservs, we could not be certain of how many surveys were actually distributed. For example, we could estimate the number of subscribers on each list but could not know how many of these individuals passed the survey on to other staff. Nevertheless, we felt that this method of distribution was valuable, cost effective, and provided the greatest amount of visibility for our study.

In addition to distribution via listservs, direct mailings of the survey went to the thirty-five members of DORAL (Development Officers in Research & Academic Libraries) and to the 206 academic libraries within the state of California. This latter grouping received the survey as a result of a research grant from CARL.¹ The grant provided an opportunity to analyze a California subset of the national study data to assess trends taking place within California as compared to the rest of the nation (Hoffman, Smith, & DiBona, 1998).²

Follow-up mailings of the survey were sent to all DORAL members and California libraries, and reminder messages, with a copy of the survey attached, were posted to each listserv two additional times. We carefully monitored the receipt of all completed surveys to avoid duplication. In all, 157 surveys were completed and returned, representing ninety library development programs nationwide.

THE SURVEY RESULTS

In analyzing the data, we concentrated on three major areas of interest to learn more about the fund-raisers and their library fund-raising programs. We also studied the results to determine a few key factors that lead to success.

WHO IS DOING THE FUND-RAISING?

This area of the survey was designed to gain a better understanding of the types of people involved in library fund-raising, what types of institutions are involved, and what the responsibilities and compensation are for library development directors.

Education

Of the respondents, 54 percent were from graduate and undergraduate institutions, 36 percent from ARL institutions, and 65 percent from public institutions. The majority of individuals responsible for library development were women (71 percent). More than half the respondents—52 percent—were in their first fund-raising job, with an average length of time in the position at zero to three years. Of the respondents, 45 percent were in newly created positions.

The survey showed that, 76 percent of the respondents held a master's degree (52 percent were degrees in library science and 45 percent held degrees in other disciplines). Only 3 percent of the survey respondents indicated any formal education in fund-raising.³ This implies that, for the most part, fund-raising is something that is learned on the job by the majority of respondents.

These results indicate that the professionals in academic library development are evenly split between professional librarians and professionals with degrees in other areas. Those development directors with library degrees, however, were more likely to have other library responsibilities than their counterparts who did not have the M.L.S. degree. These other responsibilities include public relations (76 percent), grants (52 percent), management (51 percent), strategic planning (48 percent), budget (34 percent), collection development (32 percent), statistical reporting (31 percent), reference (25 percent), and human resources (21 percent).

In the analysis, we compared salary (as of 1998) and educational degree. This cross tabulation illustrated a relatively equal split between those with degrees in librarianship and those with "other" degrees (see Table 1). At the upper end of the compensation range, librarians earn more than "other" degreed professionals do. Those earning \$76,000 and above

Table 1.
SALARY RANGE AND DEGREE STATUS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

<i>Salary Range</i>	<i>Library Degrees</i>	<i>"Other" Masters Degrees</i>
\$76,000 and above	9	
\$66,000 - \$75,999	11	4
\$41,000 - \$65,999	14	19
\$26,000 - \$40,999	4	10
< \$26,000		1

are all librarians, and most of those are library directors who do fund-raising as part of their job responsibilities.

Of those surveyed, women library development professionals earn more than men except at the upper salary range of \$76,000 and above. The largest concentration of library development professionals (45 percent) earn between \$41,000 and \$65,999.

Experience

When it came to experience in fund-raising, half of the respondents indicated between zero to five years in fund-raising. Of these, most fall into the range of one to three years experience. However, 37 percent of all respondents indicated zero to five years experience in libraries and, of that group, nearly one-third have been in libraries one year or less. Another indicator of how new library fund-raisers are is the finding that 30 percent have been in their positions one to three years, two-thirds of whom have been on the job for less than one year.

Funding and Reporting Structure

Funding for these positions is handled in a variety of ways. In most cases (71 percent) the library provides funding. In 18 percent of the cases, funding is through the campus development office, and 2 percent of the library fund-raising programs support themselves. The library and the central advancement office jointly fund positions in 9 percent of the cases.

Academic library fund-raising usually occurs within the context of the campus-wide advancement program. Because of this, there are a variety of reporting models in use between the development director and the library director. Approximately 79 percent of the development directors report to the library director. This structure seems to occur most often in younger programs, suggesting that the library administration creates the position independently of campus development. Only 3 percent report solely to the head of university development, and 19 percent have a dual or "dotted-line" reporting relationship between the library director and/or the campus director of development. This type of dual reporting is more predominant in mature library programs and is more typical of university development programs in general.

Table 2.
JOB CLASSIFICATIONS

<i>Classification</i>	<i>Percentage of Respondents</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>
Management Staff	45	40
Faculty	35 (24% tenured or tenure-track)	31
Staff	11	10
Other	8	7
		88 total

Title, Salary, and Work

Nearly 85 percent of all the library development directors who responded to the survey work full-time. Regardless of classification (see Table 2), 70 percent participate as members of the library management team.

When position titles are compared to salary, library development directors are comparably compensated up to the salary of \$66,000, whether classed as management staff or faculty. More faculty than management staff earn between \$66,000 and \$75,000; however, compensation for faculty drops dramatically while development directors classed as management staff (more than any other category) earn \$76,000 or above. Staff and "other" classifications earn considerably less and most fall within the \$26,000 to \$40,000 range. This trend again seems to be more prevalent in newer programs where fund-raising has not yet been given a full-time focus.

THE FUND-RAISING PROGRAMS

According to survey results, library fund-raising programs are proliferating. Most of the survey responses came from programs that have been in existence for ten years or less (see Table 3). We received only one response from a program in existence for twenty-five years. Where this trend is happening becomes clearer when we look at the types of libraries that responded to the survey. The majority of respondents, 81 percent, 63 percent of which are public institutions, are from non-ARL libraries. While these numbers may not be representative of all library programs, it is clear that there has been a national surge in new programs beginning in recent years.

Table 3.
AGE OF FUND-RAISING PROGRAMS

<i>Number of Years</i>	<i>Percentage of Responses</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>
0 - 3 years of age	41	35
3 - 10 years of age	41	35
Older than 10 years	17	15
		85 total

GOALS AND COSTS OF FUND-RAISING

Fund-raising goals were another area of interest. The average goal was \$1.1 million per year. This number is skewed because some institutions were involved in a capital campaign at the time of their response and included their campaign goals when answering this question. About 79 percent indicated goals of up to \$1 million; however, the average annual goal seemed to be in the \$600,000 range.

To begin to gauge the amount of private support being raised by academic library fund raisers, we asked for the estimated average amount

raised annually (this time excluding campaign year averages). More than 45 percent of the respondents raised up to \$100,000 annually. However, when we broke down the private support by type of institution, we found that public institutions raised an average of \$450,000 while private institutions raised an average of almost \$900,000.

The following breakdown of types of gifts also provides insight: 47 percent of all gifts are outright cash gifts from individuals; 29 percent are planned gifts; 17 percent are gifts in kind; and 19 percent are gifts from corporations and foundations (excluding sponsored research and federal grant programs).

The cost of doing fund-raising was another consideration. Results again are closely linked to the newer programs. For example, responses indicated that budgets to run library fund-raising programs, on average, were \$12,000 per year. However, the more successful programs spent \$25,000 annually (not including salaries) to support their programs. Nearly 81 percent of the programs have some type of clerical support. Older, more established, program budgets can run as high as \$150,000, not including staffing costs.

LIBRARY DONORS, FRIENDS, AND ADVISORY GROUPS

To be successful in library fund-raising, libraries need donors. Whether we agree or not, the age-old argument that "the library doesn't have alumni" does affect the size of the donor pool. We found that, in comparison with campus units that have alumni, the library donor pools are quite small (see Table 4). Only one respondent, who had just concluded a capital campaign, indicated a donor pool of more than 10,000 active donors.

Table 4.
SIZE OF DONOR POOL

<i>Number of Active Donors</i>	<i>Percentage of Responses</i>	<i>Number of Respondents</i>
0 - 500	44	29
501 - 1,500	35	23
1,501 - 6,000	20	13
6,001 and above	1	1
		66 total

The characteristics of the donor pool are also of interest. Friends and community members make up the largest group of 40 percent followed by alumni at 29 percent; foundations/corporations at 11 percent; parents at 8 percent; and students at 5 percent.

The traditional Friends groups play a major role within the library fund-raising arena. While 76 percent of the respondents have a Friends

group, only 58 percent of these groups are part of the library's fund-raising program. More than 56 percent include the Friends groups in the annual fund solicitations. In 83 percent of the libraries, the development directors have some administrative responsibility for Friends, yet, in spite of this, 75 percent spend less than 5 percent of their time managing the Friends group activities.

Advisory boards seem to be fairly common; 45 percent of the respondents have a development board, 67 percent a Friends advisory board. In 15 percent of the cases, these two boards were one and the same; however, in 57 percent of the responses, the two boards were totally separate with no relationship with each other.

FUND-RAISING PRIORITIES

Another goal of the survey was to gain a better understanding of the fund-raising programmatic priorities within the academic library community. To do this we developed a list of twelve priorities and asked respondents to rank them. These are the results in priority order (see Table 5).

Table 5.
Top Fund-Raising Priorities for Academic Libraries in Rank Order

<i>Priority</i>	<i>Fund-Raising Program</i>
1	Major gifts
2	Endowments
3	Grow (expand) endowments
4	Develop planned gifts (bequests, trusts, annuities, etc.)
5	Corporate and/or foundation grants
6	Prospecting for planned gifts
7	Grow (expand) the annual fund
8	Capital campaign
9	Grow (expand) the Friends group
10	Special gifts/mini-campaigns
11	Develop the annual giving program
12	Establish Friends group

As seen in this table, the attraction of major gifts is the number one priority for survey respondents. Clearly, academic library fund-raisers understand the importance of major gifts to their programs. Major gifts are seen to be at the heart of a successful fund-raising program. A major gift initiative requires special attention and a significant commitment of time and resources to have it pay off. In the long run, 90 percent of the money raised comes from major gift donors (Steele & Elder, 1992, p. 65).

We were also curious about the types of fund-raising activities being utilized to attract private funding in academic libraries and how successful they are. The top five fund-raising programs and their success ratings are shown in Table 6.

Table 6.
Top Five Fund-Raising Activities and Program Success Rating

Fund-Raising Activity	Rating
1. Book plating (in honor/memory of)	Very successful
2. Endowments (tied with) Social Events/ Donor recognition events	Very successful
3. Planned giving and bequests program	Moderately successful
4. Annual fund	Moderately successful
5. Fund-raising events (tied with) direct mail campaigns	Moderately successful

FACTORS OF SUCCESS

One of the goals of this survey was to identify factors for success in academic library fund-raising. First, we had to define "success" for the purposes of this study. The most important indicator of success was the amount of money raised in the fund-raising program. Clearly, this "bottom-line" approach does not take into consideration many other factors that can determine success, so we looked at dollars raised in conjunction with the following key factors to determine success:

- **Age of the program.** The most statistically significant factor was the age of the library fund-raising program. As most of us know, it takes time and cultivation of prospects to raise money and, as a result, the number of years engaged in fund-raising efforts is a critical factor of success. The most successful program in terms of dollars raised is the one that has been in existence for twenty-five years. Next, on average, are those programs in existence for 6 to 15 years. In fact, programs seven years or older raise the most funds although some younger programs have had success. Not surprisingly, average funds raised are insignificant for the first two years of a program and seem to remain quite low until the sixth year. This information is important for those libraries planning to implement a fund-raising program. The new program may take several years of support before the benefits of the program are visible.
- **Size of the donor pool.** The next significant indicator was the number of donors in the database. Not surprisingly, libraries with the largest donor pools have the greatest success. It turns out that these libraries are the ones with mature fund-raising programs. This fact then established a direct correlation between the age of the program, size of the donor base, and amount raised.
- **Involvement of the library director.** Another success factor was the involvement of the library director in the fund-raising effort. Involvement could loosely be defined as any type of hands-on fund-raising, including developing donor strategies, setting fund-raising goals, do-

nor cultivation, campaign planning, and gift solicitations. We found that those institutions with the highest dollars raised had directors who were involved in fund-raising, on average, 50 percent of the time. We also asked the development directors to provide a rating indicating their perception of the director's involvement. According to the results, 24 percent of the library directors are always involved (i.e., accompany the director of development on visits to donors, etc.), 46 percent are usually involved, 28 percent occasionally involved, and only 2 percent are never involved.

- **Time on task.** Another indicator of success is the amount of time devoted to fund-raising activities. As mentioned earlier, some library development directors have a range of assignments broader than just focusing on raising external dollars. However, those who spend the largest percentage of their time on fund-raising raised the most funds. Development directors who spend at least 75 percent of their time with donors raise more funds for their libraries than do those who spend 50 percent or less time. These individuals also have the greatest success overall in raising funds for their programs. Statistically, development directors without other library responsibilities raise more funds. Development directors hired specifically to raise funds garner more funds by almost four-fold.

The number one priority, according to survey results, is major gifts. Historically, time spent on cultivating major gifts has the most significant impact on fund-raising success. However, major gifts require much time and energy over an extended period of time before results start to show. Time on task also allows the development director to focus energy on fewer big gifts rather than on a larger number of small gifts. The overall benefits to the program are increased dollars for specific programs with less cost per dollar raised.

- **Type of institutions.** The survey results showed that private institutions are raising more funds annually than public institutions, which is not a surprise. According to the Council for Aid to Education (1999), private institutions of all types (research, liberal arts, two-year) raise more than public institutions. Part of this success can be based on the fact that the role of philanthropy has been woven into the culture of private institutions. On average, private universities have been involved in fund-raising efforts much longer than many of their public counterparts. Public and, in particular, state-supported institutions are struggling to change the perception that funding is adequate and is the primary responsibility of the legislature.

The survey also showed that research universities far surpass all other types of institutions in raising funds. The average for these institutions is \$1,100,000 raised annually as compared to community colleges at an average of \$100,000.

- **Friends groups** that are a part of the annual giving programs raised substantially more funds than Friends groups that are not.
- **Programs with the highest fund-raising goals** raised the most. This fact might seem obvious. Although these figures seem to indicate involvement in a capital campaign, it appears that those institutions that aim high in their goals, even without a campaign, have greater success in reaching their goals than do those with more conservative expectations. One can speculate, however, that a mature program has larger goals based on historical data from years of fund-raising, while a newer program may have less information on which to base realistic goal setting.
- **Programs that are connected to the central advancement effort** raise substantially more funds. A variety of factors may be operative with this link to a central structure. More than likely it is the level of support and access to central fund-raising services (such as annual fund, planned gifts, and prospect research) that enables a program to thrive, as compared to a program that has been required to sustain a comprehensive fund-raising effort on its own. Central support may also serve to provide a higher level of visibility for library needs which in turn can help to showcase the library more effectively or provide greater access to unrestricted donors.
- Development directors with four or more years in fund-raising raise more funds. Again, seven years appears as a “peak” number of years.

CONCLUSION

What does all this tell us? Academic library fund-raising is a growing trend in the profession. It is no longer limited to private institutions but is emerging as a driving force in the public sector as well. Successful fund-raising takes time, resources, and commitment. The program itself needs a chance to mature, and the development officer and the director of the library need to focus their energies on the task at hand. The more time the development officer can focus on fund-raising, the greater the chance for success.

Various factors affect success. Even if each factor is present, there is no guarantee that success will occur. A new fund-raising program may take several years of support before the benefits of the program are visible but, overall, the effort seems to be worthwhile.

“Is fund-raising a science—or an art? . . . There are certainly tried and true fund-raising formulas and development procedures. But because these formulas and procedures evolve from experiences of human nature, one can view fund-raising as both an art and a science” (Gornish, 1998, p. 94). With these thoughts in mind, the factors of success represent the collective experience of the survey respondents. The results are not in any way exhaustive but begin to identify patterns and trends within the realm of

academic library fund-raising. These results are a starting point to begin to quantify and qualify library fund-raising activities in the academic arena. They also form the foundation for identifying key areas for consideration in the creation and evolution of new fund-raising programs and address directions for strategic planning and staffing of college and university library-development organizations.

NOTES

- ¹ CARL inaugurated its annual Research Award program the same year we launched the survey. The award is designed to provide funding for special projects that benefit the California academic library community. Because of the anticipated benefits of our development survey, we submitted a proposal to CARL and, in October 1997, this proposal was the recipient of the first annual CARL Research Grant Award.
- ² Not surprisingly, the California trends mirrored those taking place on a national level. Because of the sheer number of public academic libraries in the state, new academic library programs increased significantly. However, when compared to national trends, these numbers are representative of what is taking place across the country.
- ³ There are no true degree programs for fund-raising; however, there are a number of continuing education opportunities available for fund-raising professionals. These include coursework, certificate programs, and seminars (some for continuing education credit and some for no credit) offered by a variety of universities, private schools, associations, and other nonprofits.

REFERENCES

- California State University. (1994). *Transforming CSU libraries for the 21st century: A strategic plan of the CSU Council of Library Directors*. Long Beach, CA: CSU.
- Council for Aid to Education. (1999). *Voluntary support for education 1998*. New York, CAE. Retrieved July 29, 1999 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.cae.org/VSE/vse1998/t03.htm>.
- Gornish, S. E. (1998). How to apply fund-raising principles in a competitive environment. *Library Administration & Management*, 12(1), 94-103.
- Hoffman, I. M.; Smith, A.; & DiBona, L. (1998). California academic library development: A preliminary report. *CARL Newsletter*, 21(June), 2-5.
- Kratz, C. E. (1997). Administrators' update: President's column. *Library Administration & Management*, 11(4), 196-197.
- Steele, V., & Elder, S. D. (1992). *Becoming a fundraiser: The principles and practice of library development*. Chicago: American Library Association.

APPENDIX

ACADEMIC LIBRARY FUND-RAISING SURVEY

The purpose of this survey is to examine, analyze, and assess the growing trend of fund-raising in academic libraries. This survey will be used to construct a profile of the academic library fund-raiser, what our backgrounds are, how our positions vary, how much we raise, who are our donors, what are our programs.

We will make every effort to keep responses confidential. If you would like complete anonymity, please return your survey via U.S. mail. If you would like a paper copy of this survey to complete, or if you know of someone who may wish a copy, please let us know. DEADLINE IS OCTOBER 18, 1996

SECTION I: ABOUT YOU

1. What is your gender?

- female
 male

2. What is your highest education level?

- Bachelor
 Masters
 Doctorate
 other: _____

3. In what area(s) is (are) your degree(s) or certificate(s)?

- Librarianship
 Fund-raising
 Both
 other: _____

4. How many years have you worked in fund-raising?

- ____ years

5. How many years have you worked in libraries?

- ____ years

6. Is this your first fund-raising position?

- Yes
 No

7. Have you had any continuing education in fund-raising?

- Yes
 No

Please describe: _____

8. What is your annual salary (or equivalent)?

- 18K-25K
- 26K-40K
- 41K-50K
- 51K-65K
- 66K-75K
- 76K and above

SECTION II: ABOUT YOUR JOB

9. What is your position title? _____

10. Is your position (check all that apply):

- full-time
- part-time
- temporary
- permanent
- volunteer
- other (please describe) _____

11. What is your current job classification?

- staff
- management staff
- faculty
- other: _____

12. Is your position tenure track or tenured?

- Yes, tenure track or tenured
- Not tenure track or tenured
- Does not apply

13. Do you have retreat rights?

- Yes
- No
- Does not apply

14. Was this a newly created position when you were hired?

- Yes
- No

15. Were you hired specifically to do fund-raising?

- Yes
- No

16. If no, (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- were you appointed from within to do fund-raising?

- was fund-raising delegated to you?
- did you volunteer to be involved?
- other, please describe: _____

17. To whom do you report?

- Library Dean/Library Director
- Director of Development
- both
- other: _____

18. Is your position

- funded by the library
- funded by campus development
- funded by the library fund-raising program
- volunteer
- other (please describe) _____

19. How long have you been in this position?

- less than 1 year
- 1-3 years
- 3-5 years
- more than 5 years

20. Is this position a part of the library management team?

- Yes
- No

21. How much of the library fund-raising activities are your responsibility?

- 100%
- 75%
- 50%
- 25%
- 10%

22. Percent of your time spent on fund-raising:

- 100% (if 100% go directly to question #23)
- 75%
- 50%
- 25%
- 10%

23. If less than 100% of your time is spent on fund-raising, please describe the other type(s) of work: (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- reference work
- collection development
- management

- human resources
- strategic planning
- statistical reporting
- budget
- public relations
- grant writing and grants development
- other: _____

24. Percent of time spent with major donors:

- 100%
- 75%
- 50%
- 25%
- 10%

25. Do you have a support staff?

- Yes
- No

26. Is your clerical support

- full-time
- part-time
- shared
- none at all

27. Is your clerical support

- paid by library
- paid by campus
- paid from fund-raising funds
- volunteer
- student assistant

SECTION III: ABOUT YOUR LIBRARY

28. What kind of institution?

- graduate
- graduate & undergraduate
- undergraduate
- community college
- other

29. Is your library a member of the ARL (Association of Research Libraries)?

- Yes
- No

30. Is your institution
 Public
 Private?

31. What is your annual library budget? _____

SECTION IV: FUND-RAISING

32. How long has your library had a fund-raising program?
 years

33. How would you describe your fund-raising program?
 new program
 developing program
 established program
 mature program

34. What is your annual fund-raising goal? _____

35. Who sets this goal? _____

36. How much is your annual fund-raising budget? _____

37. Who sets this amount? _____

38. Do you have a Friends group?
 Yes
 No

39. Percent of time spent with Friends group:
 100% 75% 50%
 25% 10% less than 10%

40. Is your Friends group:
 part of main fund-raising program
 run under separate organization

41. Is your Friends group part of the annual giving program?
 Yes
 No

42. What is your administrative responsibility to the Friends group?
 advisory
 liaison
 primary manager
 none at all
 other: _____

43. What percentage of the library director's time is devoted to fund-raising?

- 100%
- 75%
- 50%
- 25%
- 10%
- less than 10%

44. How would you describe your library director's involvement with fund-raising?

- always involved
- usually involved
- occasionally involved
- never involved

45. Is your fund-raising program a part of the campus-wide advancement program?

- Yes
- No

46. Is your campus advancement program

- centralized
- decentralized
- combination

47. On average, how much do you raise annually through your library's fund-raising effort?

\$ _____

48. How many donors in your donor database?

49. Please assign percentages to your donor pool:

- % Friends of the library
- % alumni
- % parents
- % students
- % foundations/corporations
- % community members

50. Do you have a development advisory board?

- Yes
- No

51. Do you have a friends advisory board?

- Yes
- No

52. Are these boards one and the same?

- Yes
- No

53. If not, what is their relationship?

- No relationship
- Friends board is a subgroup of development board
- Development board is a subgroup of Friends board
- Other (please describe) _____

SECTION VI: PROGRAMS

54. What is the breakdown of donations?

- % cash gifts
- % gifts-in-kind
- % bequests/planned gifts
- % foundation/corp gifts

55. What are the fund-raising priorities for your library?

- 1=not a priority, 5= high priority
- establish endowments
 - grow endowments
 - establish friends group
 - grow friends group
 - major gifts
 - corporation/foundation grants
 - planned gifts prospecting
 - develop planned gifts
 - establish annual giving program
 - grow annual giving program
 - capital campaign
 - special gifts/mini campaigns
 - other: _____
 - other: _____

56. What types of programs have you done and how successfully?

- 0=too soon to tell/1= not successful/5=very successful
- book plating
 - phonathons
 - endowments
 - capital campaigns
 - fund-raising events
 - social events
 - bequests
 - athletics partnerships

- alumni partnerships
- planned gifts
- annual fund
- direct mail
- emeriti
- special gifts/mini-campaigns
- brick campaigns
- other: _____
- other: _____

57. Are you still involved in any of these programs? If so, which ones?
(CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)

- book plating
- phonathons
- endowments
- capital campaigns
- fund-raising events
- social events
- bequests
- athletics partnerships
- alumni partnerships
- planned gifts
- annual fund
- direct mail
- emeriti
- special gifts/mini-campaigns
- brick campaigns
- other: _____
- other: _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!!!