



Office of the Provost  
& Vice-President  
(Academic)

I'm pleased to share the McMaster Libraries Budget Review report, which charts a proposed path forward for our library system.

I'm proud to say that this external report, authored by a group of experienced colleagues from the University of Toronto, Michigan State University and McMaster University, highlights the clear, deep strength of our library employees and the tremendous service they offer to our students, researchers, faculty and staff.

There is always room to look at what we can do differently and to collectively improve.

I often say that we are 'One University' with shared goals, and this document is a perfect example of this. Reflected within its pages are highlights of natural alignment between our University Library and Health Sciences Library, and the promise of how shared financial and staffing resources could complement and enhance how best to support teaching and learning, research and student success.

I hope you will take time to carefully read the recommendations, which are focused on the following areas: Organization, Budget and Staffing, Collections, and Capital Needs.

I want to extend my thanks to the external and internal reviewers who thoughtfully completed this process, and to everyone who shared questions, and offered insights with the reviewers.

I've asked that a working group from the University Library, the Health Sciences Library and key partners be struck to identify the pathway forward for consideration by the provost and the dean and vice-president, Faculty of Health Sciences, by August 31, 2024.

As chief budget officer, I look forward to working with my colleagues within our University Library, the Health Sciences Library and other key partners to ensure that we continue to deliver our goals and best support our community.

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Susan Tighe".

Susan Tighe  
Provost and Vice-President (Academic)

## McMaster Libraries Budget Review - External Review 2024 Review Team Report April 19, 2024

### Review Team

Larry P. Alford, University Chief Librarian, University of Toronto Libraries  
Neil Romanosky, Dean of Libraries, Michigan State University  
Lou Mitton, Controller, McMaster University

### Review Coordinator

Melissa Pool, AVP Academic Planning and Finance, McMaster University

### Table of Contents

<b>Purpose of the Review</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Executive Summary</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Recommendations</b> .....	<b>6</b>
2.1 Organization.....	6
2.2 Budget and Staffing.....	9
2.3 Collections.....	11
2.4 Capital Needs.....	13
<b>Appendix 1: Terms of Reference Questions and Brief Responses</b> .....	<b>14</b>
<b>Appendix 2: Review Schedule</b> .....	<b>16</b>

### PURPOSE OF THE REVIEW

To review the mandate and effectiveness of the McMaster Libraries with a particular focus on fiscal sustainability. To identify gaps or areas of under-investment. To identify programs or functions where investment could be reduced, eliminated, or streamlined. To identify areas of duplication of effort or expense between the University Library and the Health Sciences Library. To recommend changes to current funding arrangements, organizational or governance structures, policies, budgetary practices, or other mechanisms that could be put into place to allow the libraries to better respond to changes in institutional priorities, research expansion and new education programs. To match the aspirations of McMaster Libraries with fiscal and governance structure recommendations that will support the libraries in attaining those aspirations. To advise on opportunities and potential challenges going forward.

## 1. Executive Summary

The reviewers were asked to review the McMaster University Libraries with an emphasis on reviewing budget and resources available to operate the libraries. A significant amount of documentation in the form self-studies for the University Library and the Health Sciences Library, and analysis of the operating budgets for both libraries, benchmarking information, a description of the McMaster budget process, and terms of reference were provided. The Terms of Reference (TOR) included six questions with 17 additional sub-questions. Those questions with brief answers are included as Appendix 1. In many cases, however, we refer to the report for more comprehensive answers.

The reviewers spent two days on site (February 5 – 6, 2024) meeting with library staff and librarians from both the Health Sciences and University Libraries along with stakeholders from across the university. The schedule is attached as Appendix 2.

It was clear in the meetings that the library staff are dedicated to supporting research, teaching, and learning and enhancing the student experience at McMaster. They are deeply knowledgeable professionals who engage with faculty and students. The libraries and the library staff are valued by the stakeholders for their expertise. We heard no significant criticisms of staff or collections by stakeholders. We did hear and observe significant concerns about the condition of the space in the William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections as well as in the rest of Mills Library. The Mills Library is clearly used by students far in excess of its actual capacity.

Some stakeholders appear to have a limited understanding of the role of libraries in areas such as open access, research data management, digital research, and even the licensing and discovery of the research record in electronic format. There was also a limited understanding among some about the increasing costs driven by three decades of extraordinary inflation in scholarly communications, new areas of research opportunity created by the digitization of the research record, and policy changes around open access and research data preservation being contemplated or in place by Canadian and US funding agencies.

We believe the organizational and budget issues facing the libraries will be addressed by our recommendations. We also believe those recommendations will allow the McMaster libraries to thrive and provide even more robust support to research, learning, and teaching as well as enhancing the student experience at McMaster University.

For ease, we have divided the report into sections on organization, budget and staffing, collections, and capital needs. The recommendations are at the end of each section and are reproduced below.

## Organization

We came away with an understanding that McMaster University is well supported by its libraries. Both the University Library (UL) and Health Sciences Library (HSL) are central in the university's strategic priorities in teaching, learning, research, and inclusive excellence. The leaders of both libraries are deeply engaged with partners across the university and North America on issues in academic and health sciences librarianship. Over the past 18-24 months, both libraries have been furthering collaborations in key areas such as equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI), research data management, and collections management. Given what we perceive as great forward movement in the work and alignment of the two libraries with respect to university strategies, we recommend the joining of the UL and HSL into one University Libraries system serving McMaster University as a whole—a one library, one university approach. The University Librarian should represent and lead the entire organization. The Director, Health Sciences Library should become a permanent member of the libraries' senior leadership team (with an Associate University Librarian title) while maintaining a dotted reporting line to the Executive Vice Dean, Associate Vice President, Faculty of Health Sciences. This position should also continue to represent the libraries within the Faculty of Health Sciences and in national and international health sciences groups. We believe that such a joining—and the evolution of a unified University Libraries strategy—would lead to some of the following key benefits:

- a more seamless student and faculty experience of the libraries
- a more coordinated approach to building and stewarding collections
- the build-out of more university-wide services to support scholarly communications, research data management and preservation, student success and wellness, and new forms of digital research
- realization of some administrative efficiencies, such as eliminating the need for cross-charging entries across the libraries

## Budget and Staffing

We recommend the following with respect to the budgets and staffing of the libraries:

1. Joining the UL and HSL operating budgets into one budget administered under the authority of the University Librarian. Create an organizational structure that ensures needs from all faculties and departments are considered in administering the operating budget under the concept of one library to support one university.
2. We believe investment is needed in staff and the operating budget in the UL as a high priority. We recommend an initial focus on the development of a five-year staffing plan for the University Libraries with a phased approach and attendant investments to hire key positions outlined in the review materials.
3. Secure long-term, sustainable funding for the Sherman Centre for Digital Scholarship as part of the creation of a new, unified budget model for the University Libraries.

## Collections

We recommend the following with respect to the collection budgets of the libraries:

1. Join the UL and HSL collection budgets into one budget administered under the authority of the University Librarian. Create an organizational structure that ensures needs from all faculties and departments are considered in administering the collection budget under the concept of one library to support one university.
2. Protect the consolidated collection budget by:
  - a. Creating an envelope for the consolidated collection budget separate from the operating budget with the ability to transfer funds into the collection budget from operations to meet special needs and opportunities.
  - b. Continue to protect the collection budget from currency fluctuations.
  - c. Protect the collection budget from across the board or targeted university cuts.
  - d. Provide inflation funding annually based on an analysis of known increases and predicted increases to create a blended rate.
  - e. Involve the library early in planning for new programs.

## Capital Needs

We recommend the following with respect to capital needs of Mills Library in particular:

1. We strongly recommend that planning for a renovation of and addition to Mills Library begin, given the inferior quality of the spaces and heavy student use of the facility. We believe that planning could in turn lead to a significant fundraising opportunity.
2. We strongly recommend that the above planning should prioritize renovation and/or relocation of the William Ready Division of Archives and Research Collections within Mills Library. These extremely valuable and unique collections are at significant risk due to the conditions in which they are currently housed.

## 2. Recommendations

### 2.1 Organization

We came away from this review with a firm understanding that McMaster University is well supported by its libraries. Both the University Library (UL) and Health Sciences Library (HSL) are central in the university's strategic priorities in teaching, learning, research, and inclusive excellence. The leaders of both libraries are deeply engaged with partners across the university and North America on issues in academic and health sciences librarianship. They are leading strong teams of librarians and staff who are engaging in work that is central to the evolution of academic research libraries and the modern university. The foregrounding of EDI in all aspects of the libraries' work was especially noteworthy and commendable. Time and again during our review, we observed that the libraries are "hitting on all cylinders" in respect to the scope of services, collections, and supports they are providing to the McMaster community. However, as noted in the next section of this report, we believe there is inadequate staffing in the libraries

to provide many of these services at the appropriate scale for a university of McMaster's size and research intensity.

Several groups of participants noted that in the last 18-24 months, in particular, the UL and HSL teams have been working more closely together in some powerful ways, including forming a joint DEIA Committee, partnering on the rollout of strategic initiatives, and participating in hiring committees across the libraries. The two libraries also center certain university-wide services out of their respective locations. For example, the UL provides research data management services for the entire university, while the HSL does the same for knowledge synthesis research support.

The two libraries have also been exploring other kinds of synergies and efficiencies, such as more coordinated approaches to scholarly communications supports; joint digitization efforts; and aligning some financial and reporting procedures to observe greater effectiveness and efficiency across the libraries. The new established University Archives structure also presents an opportunity for the two organizations to align some key functions and positions. These efforts, both current and under consideration, are both laudable and essential at a time when interdisciplinary teaching, learning, and research are becoming the norm. Further, these collaborations are critical efforts to help both libraries navigate some of the challenges around staffing and operating budgets outlined elsewhere in this report.

Given what we perceive as great forward movement in the work and alignment of the two libraries with respect to university strategies, we recommend the joining of the UL and HSL into one University Libraries system serving McMaster University. We believe that such a join—and the evolution of a unified University Libraries strategy—would lead to some of the following key benefits:

- a more seamless student and faculty experience of the libraries
- a more coordinated approach to building and stewarding collections
- the build-out of more university-wide services to support scholarly communications, research data management and preservation, student success and wellness, and new forms of digital research
- realization of some administrative efficiencies, such as eliminating the need for cross-charging entries across the libraries

We also note that there are some real risks in continuing to operate separate library organizations, most of which can be cast as the opposite realities of the benefits outlined above.

We suggest that the focus of the joining not be solely on efficiencies—although some efficiency may be realized in the process. Rather, we suggest a focus on the creation of a unified library system that can provide more coordinated, holistic supports for student success, research, scholarly communications, and community engagement across all faculties at McMaster—an

approach informed by a one library, one university ethos. This should also be approached in a way that continues to honor and maintain embedded, productive relationships and deep expertise where it already exists in both libraries.

We offer the following as key considerations for the joining of the libraries:

- The University Librarian should represent and lead the entire organization locally, nationally, and internationally.
- The Director, Health Sciences Library should become a permanent member of the libraries' senior leadership team (with an Associate University Librarian title) while maintaining a dotted reporting line to the Executive Vice Dean, Associate Vice President, Faculty of Health Sciences. This role should continue to represent the libraries within the Faculty of Health Sciences and within national and North American health sciences groups, such as the Association of Academic Health Sciences Libraries and the AFMC Network on Libraries.
- We recommend the formation of a standing Faculty Libraries Advisory Committee that is part of academic governance at the university, as well as a Student Libraries Advisory Committee that is advisory to the University Librarian. Both groups would provide valuable perspective and input to the new library organization on many fronts. Such groups would also give the University Libraries a strong platform upon which to articulate its key role in the university's strategic priorities.
- We recommend that there be regular opportunities for managers within the libraries, as representatives of their units, to provide input into strategy and resource planning decisions.
- As noted elsewhere and in more detail in this report, there should be a consolidated University Libraries budget, separated into operations and collections envelopes.
- The University Libraries should receive support for a dedicated development officer to fill the current vacancy, not a position that is shared with other units. Fundraising work for libraries is unique within the profile of universities and requires sustained and dedicated effort to take root.
- There should be the creation of a unified University Libraries strategy, and a related five-year staffing plan that outlines staffing needs for the system vis-à-vis libraries and university strategic goals.

This recommended join will undoubtedly be difficult for some university and libraries stakeholders, while welcomed by others. With all staff in mind, there should be utmost attention paid to transparency and clarity in the rollout of the eventual plan, and to attendant organizational development and training issues that will need to be addressed and considered at each stage.

We believe that the future of the libraries is bright and will be increasingly more so under this proposed joined structure.

## 2.2 Budget and Staffing

It was clear from our conversations with stakeholders both inside and outside of the libraries that the librarians and staff at both libraries play critical roles in the advancement of McMaster's strategic goals. Librarians and staff are advancing considerable work in areas of programmatic growth for research libraries, such as research data management, knowledge synthesis research, first-year student success, and bibliometrics. Our conversations also showed that the libraries are well respected and seen as central within the university for their longstanding roles in building and providing access to collections, spaces, and services that support the university's needs.

However, in our conversations we heard a strong theme around the libraries' need for additional staff and more competitive salaries in order to continue to serve the university's needs. Based on these conversations and the benchmarking data provided to us for the review, we agree with this assessment. Data from the Canadian Association of Research Libraries show that the McMaster libraries employ fewer librarians and staff per student and per faculty compared to peer universities. Total salary spend and salaries for librarians are also very low compared to peers. The low salaries for librarians, in particular, has made recruitment of new professionals very challenging, especially as the cost of living in the greater Hamilton area has increased substantially in recent years. Several participants noted that, in years past, librarians would sometimes choose to work at McMaster in part because of the reasonable cost of living in the area vis-à-vis what were even then considered lower-than-peer salaries. Given that salaries have not kept pace with cost of living in the area, this is no longer the case.

As a result of low levels of staffing and low salaries, people in both libraries and at various levels of the organizations spoke to feelings of burnout and being stretched too thin across multiple areas of responsibility. Others noted that low staffing levels have led to inconsistent or no backup when colleagues are out of the office; uncoordinated and insufficient outreach to programs and departments (specifically in the launch of new programs at the university); and an inability to fully launch and resource new service areas that are part of some individuals' stated job responsibilities.

Stakeholders from both the UL and HSL also spoke to the powerful ways in which the two libraries have begun to work in closer alignment over the past 18-24 months. For example, research data management services are based in and provided to the entire university through the UL, while support for knowledge synthesis research (which is growing steadily across many disciplines) is provided to the entire university through the HSL. We believe that these kinds of collaborations between the libraries should and will expand in coming years, with an eye towards honoring local strengths and expertise for systemic benefit. However, this does not obviate a clear need for more staff and higher salaries across the libraries.

Further, both in our conversations and from the budget materials we received as part of the review, there are mentions of structural deficits in both the UL's and HSL's operating budgets



that have contributed to lean staffing and lack of backup coverage for some essential functions in both libraries. Both libraries have, at times, utilized salary gapping to fund core operations and, in some cases, used operational and collections monies to fund salaries. This is not sustainable. In addition, the HSL has historically received transfers from the Faculty of Health Sciences and the hospital, constituting 15-25% of its operating budget—an occurrence that is noted as being under review in the materials received for this review.

As mentioned in the previous section, we believe that the UL and HSL would ultimately benefit from being joined into a unified University Libraries system, complete with a unified operating budget, all of which is directed by the University Librarian. When constituting a unified budget for one University Libraries entity, the complexities of the aforementioned historic practices would need to be examined closely and addressed with an eye towards sustainability. In suggesting a joining of the organizations, we are not suggesting merely moving staff from one library into another, or splitting roles and responsibilities to cover needs across the system (although in some cases this may be advisable). Ultimately, based on benchmark data and our conversations and review materials, we believe there needs to be investment in the operating budget and staffing of the new University Libraries. We also believe that a unified University Libraries entity should create a five-year staffing plan that could become the basis of phased growth.

Finally, we were very impressed by a visit to the Sherman Centre for Digital Scholarship in Mills Library. The work of the Sherman Center is especially critical in supporting changing modes of teaching, learning, and research. It includes core library functions such as support for GIS, data visualization, data analysis, data collections, use of text as data, and others. Our understanding is that the funding for the Sherman Centre will be depleted in the near future. Given that demand for the services of the Centre have grown and are only positioned to grow further, we strongly recommend that sustainable funding for the Sherman Centre be secured as part of a long-term sustainable plan for funding the University Libraries.

Budget and staffing recommendations:

1. Join the UL and HSL operating budgets into one budget administered under the authority of the University Librarian. Create an organizational structure that ensures needs from all faculties and departments are considered in administering the operating budget under the concept of one library to support one university.
2. We believe investment is needed in staff and the operating budget in the UL as a high priority. We recommend an initial focus on the development of a five-year staffing plan for the University Libraries with a phased approach and attendant investments to hire key positions outlined in the review materials.

3. Secure long-term, sustainable funding for the Sherman Centre for Digital Scholarship as part of the creation of a new, unified budget model for the University Libraries.

### 2.3 Collections

Library collections, largely licensed content and the acquisition of distinctive collections, are essential to research, learning, and teaching. We heard much in our meetings about collections in both the UL and HSL. Clearly, both libraries take seriously their stewardship of the collection budget, and their combined responsibility to support research, learning, and teaching across the university.

Collection librarians are concerned that there are many unmet information needs across the university. It is true that there are always additional collections and resources to license or acquire. However, looking at the data provided in the self-study, the collection budget as a whole appears adequate. It was 7<sup>th</sup> among the U15 in 2020-21 in collection expenditures and about the same as Calgary and Ottawa. The data on collection expenditures per student are older (2018-19), but again appear to be in line with Calgary, Ottawa, and Queens. The collection expenditure per faculty member is significantly higher than McGill according to the benchmarking analysis provided. It would be useful to update these ratios in future budget requests and to provide them for all U15 institutions.

Collection staff expressed concern that they are not aware of planning for new programs early in the process, and, therefore, do not have an opportunity to evaluate what might be needed in collections to support a new program. It would be helpful to involve the library formally in program planning early in the process to evaluate the adequacy of collections to support a new program. However, it is often possible to support new programs with reallocation of resources within the existing budget. Indeed, that is the common practice in our experience with the exception of creation of a major new faculty such as law or medicine or pharmacy. Where it is not possible, a case should be made in the annual budget process with input from faculty involved in offering the new program about supplemental budget required to address collection needs. As well, the annual budget process should be used to justify any resources required to meet faculty and student needs for access to information that are not being met by the existing collection budget allocation.

The McMaster University collection budget is split between the Health Sciences Library and the University Library. Journal packages licensed through the national licensing initiative (Canadian Research Knowledge Network, or CRKN) are paid from both budgets based on the historical spend on print collections from two decades ago. Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the modern academy, both budgets support the entire university, although the HSL collection budget does appear to be strongly focused on the health disciplines housed in the Faculty of Health Sciences. We believe the collection budgets can be spent more efficiently and effectively in an interdisciplinary environment by joining them into one budget. McMaster is an outlier in having a separately administered Health Sciences Library. We address the large issue of one library to serve one university elsewhere, but clearly in terms of building

collections, a single collection budget will allow university-wide priorities to be met and budget administration will be much more efficient. Of course, the collection staff who currently administer the HSL collection budget and work with Faculty of Health Sciences will need to be included in the decision-making process for spending a joint collection budget. The University Librarian, however, should make the case for collection budget increases to the budget decision makers with both final authority and accountability.

McMaster has a history of providing inflation funding for the collection budget on request and protecting it from currency fluctuations given that many resources are priced in US dollars. We applaud the university for protecting information resources in this way, given that not covering inflation in scholarly communications, which for decades has exceeded any consumer price index, is in effect a cut to a collection budget. We strongly recommend that the university continue this practice and further enshrine the practice in budget policy by creating a “protected joint collection budget” similar to the way many universities treat utilities. For some years, the university has provided \$400,000 to the UL and \$150,000 to the HSL to cover collection inflation. That is the average inflation in the collection budget over those years to the best of our knowledge, and we applaud the university for providing that funding. We recommend that the library provide a more detailed analysis of collection inflation using known increases negotiated via CRKN combined with inflation forecasts from library information vendors such as EBSCO to create a blended inflation rate. While the outcome is likely to be about the same as the current \$550,000 allocation, we believe an annual more detailed analysis will have more credibility with budget decision makers.

We also recommend that the “protected budget” not be subject to any institutional across the board or targeted cuts. As well, it should not be possible for the University Librarian to transfer funds from the collection budget without an extraordinary and compelling reason. Transfer into the collection budget from salary gapping or other one-time sources should be allowed, however, to enable the library to meet unanticipated needs or opportunities, particularly for the acquisition of distinctive collections.

As noted, we recommend that the university continue to protect the collection budget from currency fluctuations as it has been doing for some years.

Collection recommendations summary:

1. Join the UL and HSL collection budgets into one budget administered under the authority of the University Librarian. Create an organizational structure that ensures needs from all faculties and departments are considered in administering the collection budget under the concept of one library to support one university.
2. Protect the consolidated collection budget by:

- a. Separating the consolidated collection budget from the operating budget with the ability to transfer funds into the collection budget from operations to meet special needs and opportunities.
- b. Continue to protect the collection budget from currency fluctuations.
- c. Protect the collection from across the board or targeted university cuts.
- d. Provide inflation funding annually based on an analysis of known increases and predicted increases to create a blended rate.
- e. Involve the library early in planning for new programs.

## 2.4 Capital Needs

We were able to visit both Mills Library and the Health Sciences Library briefly. We were astonished at how heavily used both facilities are. Libraries are an essential “third place” on any university campus, contributing enormously to the student experience. Students often prefer library space over other spaces for study as well as connecting socially. Unfortunately, Mills Library is not a welcoming space in terms of the quality of the facility. It is over-crowded, with almost every seat taken and students sitting on the floor during our visit. The low ceilings in the older building feel oppressive, creating uninviting space. Thus, it is even more astonishing that it appears to be so heavily used and such an important part of the McMaster student experience. We understand fully that a major renovation and expansion of student space will take years of planning and significant investment. We strongly recommend that planning for a renovation of and addition to Mills Library begin, however. That planning could in turn lead to a significant fundraising opportunity that a dedicated Development Officer for the University Library could advance as a major component of a university-wide campaign. We note the recent experience at the University of Toronto, where a 1200 seat addition to the Robarts Library was recently opened. That addition, entirely devoted to study space, is usually fully occupied while there has been no reduction in the use of older library study space. In other words, the new addition filled a previously unmet need for study space. As well, almost 60% of the construction costs came from donors who saw the need to assist with improving student experience.

We had less time in the HSL but were impressed by the facility. It is clearly well used, bright, and attractive space.

## APPENDIX 1: TERMS OF REFERENCE QUESTIONS AND BRIEF RESPONSES

1. **How does McMaster's investment in its libraries compare with that of aspirational peers?**
  - Is the collection spend reasonable for a university of McMaster's size and research intensity?
    - Yes. See the report for further information.
  - Is the size and composition of the workforce reasonable for a university of McMaster's size and research intensity?
    - No. See the report for further information.
  - Is the number of librarians reasonable for a university of McMaster's size and research intensity?
    - The staff in the University Library (UL), including librarians, is not a reasonable size. How much need there is for librarians and/or other types of staff requires more analysis and planning by the library leadership team.
  - Is the salary spend reasonable for a university of McMaster's size and research intensity?
    - See above. The UL clearly requires more staff and librarians and, therefore, a higher salary spend.
  - Are the salary ranges for librarians in line with competitors?
    - No. Librarians at McMaster appear to be significantly underpaid on average compared to peers. However, further analysis using criteria such as length of time as a librarian at McMaster and length of time since award of an MLS or equivalent is required to understand better how librarian salaries compare to peers.
2. **Are there gaps or areas of under-investment?**
  - If new resources are required, where should the priorities be? Where would additional resources bring the greatest value in terms of McMaster's teaching and research missions?
    - We do believe investment is needed in staff and the operating budget in the UL as a high priority. We recommend an initial focus on the development of a five-year staffing plan for the University Libraries with a phased approach and attendant investments to hire key positions outlined in the review materials. See the report for further information.
3. **Are there programs or functions where investment could be reduced, eliminated, or streamlined?**
  - In this short time with the information available, it is not possible to answer this question. We do believe that both the HSL and UL have

worked hard to transform the libraries and services to meet 21st century library and information needs in a research university.

**4. Is there duplication of effort and expense between the University Library and the Health Sciences Library?**

- Are there areas where the two library systems could work more closely with an eye to reducing costs and improving the user/staff experience?
  - See report and recommendation to join the two libraries under the authority of the University Librarian.
- Are there functions that should be harmonized/ blended? In some cases, can one library offer a service more effectively and at a lower cost?
  - See report and recommendation to join the two libraries under the authority of the University Librarian. We do not believe, however, that there are significant costs savings to be found. The libraries appear to be well managed.
- Are there areas where the structure brings value to the organizations and should be maintained?
  - See the report
- Are there risks / downsides associated with harmonizing/blending any of these functions?
  - See the report. There is likely to be concern from some university and library stakeholders about a joining of the two systems which must be addressed proactively and with sensitivity to those concerns.
- Both libraries have identified several gaps in their workforces. Can any of the gaps in one organization be filled by leveraging the resources of the other?
  - We do not have the information required to address this question. Addressing it should be part of a five-year staffing and budget plan with a planning process led by the University Librarian and a combined (UL and HSL) leadership team.
- What areas/functions should remain separate given McMaster’s strategic foci / strengths?
  - See report regarding recommended joining of the separate libraries to create one library for one university.

**5. Once adjustments have been made, how do we ensure the libraries’ ongoing financial sustainability?**

- Are current funding arrangements appropriate? Are there strengths in the current arrangement that should be retained? Are there weaknesses that should be addressed?
  - See report

- Are there organizational or governance structures that should be considered to improve overall efficiency, service quality and workforce satisfaction?
  - See report
- Are there policies or processes that should be considered to improve overall efficiency, service quality and workforce satisfaction?
- Are there budgetary practices that should be considered? For example, should the collections spend be separated from the operations spend for purposes of high-level analysis? Should the cost of the large consortial invoices be centralized in the University Library? Are there better ways of measuring / projecting journal inflation?
  - See report
- Are there mechanisms we could put into place that will allow the libraries to better respond to changes in institutional priorities, research expansion and new education programs?
  - See report

## 6. General Feedback

- Please suggest opportunities for future development and enhancement of the practices, performance, and outcomes of McMaster University Libraries
  - See report.