

University of Massachusetts Medical School

Worcester, MA

Benchmarking exercise

By Aubri A. Drake

ILS 560

Professor Kusak

**Target Library** - The University of Massachusetts Medical School

The University of Massachusetts was initially established in Amherst, MA as an agricultural college in 1863. The University of Massachusetts Medical School was founded in 1962 as part of the establishment of a Worcester, MA satellite location. The UMass Medical School (UMMS) is comprised of the School of Medicine, the Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, and the Graduate School of Nursing. Their degree programs are almost exclusively master's, post-master's, and doctoral degrees. It is the only public medical school in Massachusetts and is focused on primary care specialties, especially in the public and underserved populations of Massachusetts (University of Massachusetts, 2011). In 2006, a UMMS professor won a Nobel Prize in Medicine which drew attention from the medical community and furthered their reputation as a research institution. In *US News and World Report*, it is ranked among the top 10% of all medical schools in the US (UMass Medical School, n.d.).

**Peer Selection**

Given the limited number of medical schools in the US, it was difficult to find comparable institutions in the northeast that match UMMS in enrollment, endowment, and faculty. The four comparison schools were chosen based on their full-time graduate enrollment, total full-time faculty, and endowment funds (see Table 1). While UMMS is a public institution, two of the comparison schools are private. They were chosen for being located in the northeast and having a similar profile to UMMS. All five schools are classified in the Carnegie Classification 2005 Basic as medical schools.

**Table 1**

School name	Public/private	Full-time grad enrollment	Total full-time faculty	Endowment (000)
<b>UMMS</b>	<b>Public</b>	<b>1189</b>	<b>1210</b>	<b>121,831</b>
Upstate Medical	Public	1293	375	40,319
SUNY Downstate+	Public	1751	408	54,338
Mt Sinai	Private	1187	1337	534,631
Weill Cornell	Private	1066	1170	965,436
<i>Group mean</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>1297</i>	<i>900</i>	<i>343,311</i>

Source: IPEDS Data Center (Institute of Education Sciences, n.d.).

+ Note that SUNY Downstate is referenced as SUNY Health Science Center at Brooklyn by the *National Center for Educational Statistics*

Table one shows the full-time graduate enrollment for these five universities spans between approximately 1000-1800 individuals. The size of the student body being served by the library should be relatively comparable. Upstate Medical and SUNY Downstate both have very low endowments in comparison to the target school but their other elements mark them as peers. Mount Sinai and Weill Cornell are both private institutions with high endowments but their enrollment and faculty numbers indicate they are part of UMMS' peer group. With their sizable but not unattainable endowment and identical enrollment, Mount Sinai will be the aspirational school.

### Libraries:

**Table 2 – Library Inputs**

School name	Salary expenditures for librarians & professional staff*	Expenditures on materials	Total Library Expenditures	Total Expenditures per FTE student
<b>UMMS</b>	<b>1,489,538</b>	<b>3,627,000</b>	<b>5,779,740</b>	<b>5,655</b>
Upstate Medical	863,751	1,854,060	3,505,618	2,732
SUNY Downstate	1,947,002	863,667	3,602,464	2,366
Mt Sinai	1,374,022	3,331,527	5,299,211	5,981
Weill Cornell	861,462	NA	3,323,521	5,136
<i>Mean</i>	<i>1,307,155</i>	<i>2,419,064+</i>	<i>4,302,111</i>	<i>4,374</i>

Source: *National Center for Educational Statistics* (Institute of Education Sciences, 2010)

\* Many libraries suppressed data about expenditures for student assistants so total expenditure was not able to be calculated

+ Does not include Weill Cornell

In utilizing Table 2, it can be seen that UMMS provides a larger total sum towards librarians and professional staff's salaries than all of their peer libraries except for SUNY. However, this difference is explained by viewing Table 4; UMMS employs more librarians and professional staff than any other peer libraries except for SUNY. In expenditures on materials, it can also be seen that UMMS has the largest expenditures on materials and total library expenditures of any of their peer libraries. However, this difference is less significant when the total expenditures per FTE student is taken into account. For the total expenditures per FTE student, UMMS has a fairly high number but Mount Sinai does spend more. This places UMMS squarely in the top two schools of their peer group. Between the libraries of UMMS, Mount Sinai, and Weill Cornell, they have very similar per FTE expenditures. The two public libraries, Upstate Medical and SUNY, have lower per FTE expenditures but are grouped close together, placing them at the bottom of this peer group.

**Table 3 – Collection per FTE student**

School name	Books, Serial Backfile, Other	E-Books	Audiovisual materials	Current Serial Subscriptions	Electronic Reference Sources
<b>UMMS</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>0.58</b>	<b>4.46</b>	<b>0.340</b>
Upstate Medical	172	0.57	3.35	0.73	0.074
SUNY Downstate	299	2.84	0.94	4.38	0.089
Mt Sinai	98	29.8	0.16	36.3	0.162
Weill Cornell	297	11.4	NA	8.26	NA
<i>Mean</i>	<i>213</i>	<i>8.33</i>	<i>1.32+</i>	<i>10.15</i>	<i>0.163+</i>

Source: National Center for Educational Statistics (Institute of Education Sciences, 2010)

+ Does not include Weill Cornell

For Table 3, collection per FTE student was calculated based on each school's holdings divided by their FTE enrollment; this was done to show more generalizable numbers rather than simply the number of holdings. For books, serial backfile, and other materials, as well as serial

subscriptions, UMMS is solidly in the middle of their peers. However, UMMS' e-book collection is the smallest of all their peers except for Upstate Medical. Their AV collection is also the smallest of all their peers except for Mount Sinai. These are two areas they might consider doing more collections work, provided this would help meet a need of their student body. Of all their peers, UMMS has the most electronic reference sources. This is commendable and a mark of distinction that should be maintain if at all possible. Mount Sinai's e-book collection is very extensive; they offer students and staff access to more than 1,000 core health sciences textbooks (Mount Sinai Medical Center, 2010). Their serial subscription per FTE is extremely high which skews the average.

**Table 4 – Staffing**

School name	Librarians	Other Professional Staff	Support Staff	Student Assistants	Total Staff	Total Staff Per 1,000 FTE Students
<b>UMMS</b>	<b>19.44</b>	<b>4.14</b>	<b>11.75</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>35.9</b>	<b>35.13</b>
Upstate Medical	11.5	4.5	10.5	5	31.5	24.55
SUNY Downstate	9	17+	8.5	3	37.5	24.32
Mt Sinai	12	4	22.95++	0	38.95	43.96
Weill Cornell	6.7	4	15.5	0	26.2	40.49
<i>Mean</i>	<i>11.728</i>	<i>4.16</i>	<i>11.56</i>	<i>1.74</i>	<i>34.01</i>	<i>33.69</i>

Source: *National Center for Educational Statistics* (Institute of Education Sciences, 2010)

+ SUNY was excluded from the mean because it was an outlier

++ Mt Sinai was excluded from the mean because it was an outlier

Library staffing across the schools varied quite a bit in Table 4. To one extent or another, it's possible to theorize about the variety of strategies and policies utilized by each library. For example, SUNY is an anomaly. They only have 9 librarians and 8.5 support staff, both which are below the group mean, but they have 17 professional staff. It could be that they rely upon professional staff to complete the tasks librarians would normally do or it could be that they

use different methods of categorizing their staff. The difference in categorization could be one of semantics or it could be institution-wide policies affecting library staff job titles. Because of SUNY's high number of professional staff and Mount Sinai's high number of support staff, they were excluded from the mean to prevent skewing. In all categories other than student assistants, UMMS either meets the mean or exceeds it. However, Mount Sinai and Weill Cornell lead the peer group in regards to total staff per 1,000 FTE students with both of the public comparison schools, Upstate Medical and SUNY, bringing up the rear. For UMMS to stay competitive with other private schools, their staff funding needs to continue to be a priority.

**Table 5 – Library Output**

School name	Circulation Transactions per FTE	Interlibrary Loan Received per FTE	Interlibrary Loan Provided per FTE	Hours Open in Typical Week	Gate Count in Typical Week
<b>UMMS</b>	<b>34.11</b>	<b>0.919</b>	<b>7.21</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>5635</b>
Upstate Medical	8.42	6.55	6.81	114	NA
SUNY Downstate	2.13	1.61	1.32	96	5600
Mt Sinai	24.02	3.15	5.04	101	4589
Weill Cornell	30.6	3.04	1.77	108	4945
<i>Mean</i>	<i>19.86</i>	<i>3.06</i>	<i>4.43</i>	<i>103.8</i>	<i>5192.25+</i>

*+Does not include Upstate Medical*

Similar to Table 3, Table 5's Interlibrary Loans Received and Provided per FTE student was estimated using the library's transactions divided by the school's FTE enrollment. Of all their peers, UMMS completes the most circulation transactions per FTE by far. They also receive very few interlibrary loans from other libraries. This could be because the students and faculty find what resources they need within the collection. UMMS also is the top interlibrary loan provider for their entire peer group. It would seem that UMMS has an expansive collection that other libraries are utilizing. For hours open each week, UMMS falls a bit short; they are the fourth of

all five libraries in their peer group. If this is something of interest to students and faculty, perhaps the hours should be expanded. In a typical week, UMMS also has a very high gate count, placing at the top of their peer group. In general, UMMS has excellent library output. The circulation desk is extensively utilized; they provide many interlibrary loans to other institutions; few interlibrary loans are requested by their patrons; and their average gate count is exemplary.

### **Conclusion**

UMMS is an excellent school and has many aspects that place it at the top of its peer group. The library is well staffed, has a collection with depth, and is widely utilized by their patrons. In most areas, UMMS falls within the top three of the five libraries in the peer group. However, UMMS has many areas it could expand and increase its appeal to researchers and students alike. For total library expenditures, UMMS is the best public medical school out of the three in its peer group. However, for UMMS to remain competitive with other private medical schools, expanding the base amount available may need to be considered. While other parts of UMMS' collections are quite excellent, more attention may need to be paid to the e-book and audiovisual collections. Also, while UMMS' serial subscription is more extensive than either of the public medical schools, it does fall short of the two private universities in their peer group. UMMS is highly competitive in regards to library staff. They meet or exceed all aspects of staffing within their peer group; this is a strength and should be maintained. For outputs, UMMS is doing extremely well; the one thing that could potentially be improved would be an increase in the library's hours. Overall, UMMS is an exemplarily library and has many strengths. There are areas that could be improved but UMMS is quite competitive within its peer group

including the private institutions. Given some improvements, UMMS would be in the same class as its two private peer institutions.



## References

- Institute of Education Sciences (n.d.). *IPEDS Data Center – Look up an Institution*. National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved on September 30, 2012 from <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/datacenter/Snapshotx.aspx?unitid=acb1b1b2abb3>
- Institute of Education Sciences (2010). *Library Statistics Program – Compare Academic Libraries*. National Center for Educational Statistics. Retrieved on October 7, 2012 from <http://nces.ed.gov/surveys/libraries/compare/default.aspx>
- Mount Sinai Medical Center (2010). *About Us – Collections*. Retrieved on October 7, 2012 from <http://library.mssm.edu/services/collections.shtml>
- National Association of College and University Business Officers (2009). *2008 NACUBO Endowment Study*. Retrieved on September 30, 2012 from <http://www.nacubo.org/documents/research/NES2008PublicTable-AllInstitutionsByFY08MarketValue.pdf>
- UMass Medical School (n.d.). *A Glimpse at the University of Massachusetts Medical School*. Retrieved on September 30, 2012 from <http://www.umassmed.edu/about/facts/index.aspx?linkidentifier=id&itemid=1672>
- The University of Massachusetts (2011). *The University of Massachusetts System*. Retrieved on September 30, 2012 from <http://www.massachusetts.edu/system/about.html>.