

11-13-2015

## The Libraries They Are A-Changin': How Libraries Reorganize

John Novak

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, john.novak@unlv.edu

Annette Day

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, annette.day@unlv.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/lib\\_articles](https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/lib_articles)



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

---

### Repository Citation

Novak, J., Day, A. (2015). The Libraries They Are A-Changin': How Libraries Reorganize. *College & Undergraduate Libraries*, 22 358-373.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10691316.2015.1067663>

This Article is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by Digital Scholarship@UNLV with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Article in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Article has been accepted for inclusion in Library Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact [digitalscholarship@unlv.edu](mailto:digitalscholarship@unlv.edu).

## **The Libraries They Are A-Changin': How Libraries Reorganize**

### **Authors**

John Novak & Annette Day  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

### **Abstract**

This paper will report on the results of a study of library reorganizations in the literature. The authors identified five steps common to all library reorganizations, and this paper describes those steps as well as two management change theories most mentioned in the literature--the eight-step process of change by John Kotter and *Reframing Organizations* by Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal. The paper will draw conclusions formed by a comparison of these theoretical models to the practice and real life experience of reorganizations as described by libraries in the literature.

### **Keywords**

Reorganization, academic libraries, change management, four-frame model, library organization, restructuring

### **Introduction**

In the spring of 2014, led by a new Division Director, the Logistics, Resources and Distribution Services (LRDS) division at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) Libraries began the process of reorganization.

To inform the reorganization, the authors began to review the literature for examples of libraries that had undertaken successful reorganizations of any scale, either across the whole organization or in specific divisions or departments. The authors were looking for successful examples of change management models or organizational theories such as total quality management that we could use to guide our

process. We felt that a structured and planned approach, guided by an articulated management model, was necessary to help us understand the stages of the process and to facilitate clearer communication about the process. We were surprised to find that in our study of library reorganization literature, few libraries used defined management models. Those that discussed them in reference to their reorganization were usually analyzing retrospectively through the lens of a management model or framework. The literature showed that libraries were intentional about their process, and that they realized the need for structure and communication around their reorganization; however, they seldom utilized management theories. In the end, we saw a clear commonality in how libraries moved through their reorganization, with five common stages undertaken to identify, design, and enable a change.

This paper will report on the results of our study, explaining the five steps that we identified as common to all libraries in the reorganization process. We will also describe two management theories that appeared most regularly in the literature pertaining to library reorganizations. These will be useful to libraries such as ours that are looking for these types of models to help us understand and plan change. The article will then draw conclusions formed by a comparison of the theoretical models to the practice and real life experience of reorganizations, as described by libraries in the literature and our own reorganization.

### **Management Change Theories**

In reading articles about reorganizations, the authors observed that two management models were frequently referenced. They are the eight-step process of change by John Kotter (Kotter 1995; Kotter 1996) and *Reframing Organizations* by Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal (Bolman and Deal 2013). Each model provides a roadmap for leaders to implement change effectively.

First, Kotter identifies an eight-stage process for transforming an organization (Kotter 1995). They are

- 1) Establishing a sense of urgency;
- 2) Forming a powerful guiding coalition;

- 3) Creating a vision;
- 4) Communicating the vision;
- 5) Empowering others to act on the vision;
- 6) Planning for and creating short-term wins;
- 7) Consolidating improvements and producing still more change;
- 8) Institutionalizing new approaches.

Kotter first discusses this eight-stage process in the article “Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail” (Kotter 1995). Later, he expands and fleshes out his ideas in the book *Leading Change* (Kotter 1996). In his article, Kotter explains that he developed the eight stages from his observation of over 100 reorganizations. He structures his essay by showing what results when leaders of change skip a step in the eight-stage process. He calls these errors. For example, the error for step one is called “not establishing a great enough sense of urgency” (Kotter 1995, 97). What happens when a leader fails to establish a sense of urgency within an organization? Kotter states, “when the urgency rate is not pumped up enough, the transformation process cannot succeed, and the long-term future of the organization is in jeopardy” (98).

In *Leading Change*, Kotter expands on his article to talk about how leaders can successfully change an organization. Early in the book, he makes a distinction between managing change and leading change. Management is involved in the planning and budgeting, the organizing and staffing, and the controlling and problem solving duties of an organization (Kotter 1996, 26). Leaders, on the other hand, establish direction, align people, and motivate and inspire staff (26). Leaders can overcome inertia by creating a vision of a different future that staff buy into and produce change on a large-scale level that sticks. Kotter’s book, and this eight-stage process, are thus aimed at leaders attempting lasting change.

*Leading Change* differs from Kotter's article in that he explains how leaders can successfully implement each stage of the process rather than detail common errors leaders make. For example, the chapter on establishing a sense of urgency details sources of complacency among staff and how these need to be overcome to establish urgency. These sources of complacency include "the absence of a major and visible crisis" and "low overall performance standards" and "organizational structures that focus employees on narrow functional goals" (40). To establish urgency, Kotter recommends creating a crisis or holding people "accountable for broader measures of business performance" or bombarding staff about missed future opportunities due to "the organization's current inability to pursue those opportunities" (44).

The IT reorganization at the J. Willard Marriott Library at the University of Utah is one example of a library that applied parts of Kotter's eight-steps throughout the process. This reorganization in 2012 was detailed in an article by Soehner entitled "Leading Change in Libraries: A Case Study." In this article, Soehner states how the Marriott Library modified and utilized the first three stages to begin the change process. Soehner mentions that a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats) analysis was used to create a sense of urgency. Soehner then describes how the Marriott Library formed a powerful, guiding coalition and then created a vision (Soehner 2015).

Soehner's article also provides four observations on the reorganization that showed how the implementation of Kotter's change process is still difficult to accomplish. She observed that some staff resisted the change, that some managers were not ready to act as leaders, that IT employees felt that they were not heard by administration, and that "more communication might have made the process less contentious" (6). Soehner's observations will resonate with any leader who has tried to implement change within an organization. Even Kotter, near the end of his article, admits that "in reality, even successful change efforts are messy and full of surprises" (Kotter 1995, 103). Since any change process

deviates from even the best of plans, how can leaders of change better equip themselves to find pockets of resistance and minimize the surprises during a reorganization?

Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, in their book *Reframing Organizations*, provide an answer. Their book offers leaders a method called reframing to examine a complex situation in order to gain a more comprehensive understanding. Reframing involves examining a situation through one frame and then changing the frame to analyze the situation for further insights. A frame, as defined by the authors, is “a coherent set of ideas or beliefs forming a prism or lens that enables one to see and understand more clearly what goes on from day to day” (Bolman and Deal 2013, 41). The authors identify four frames through which a leader can analyze a situation: structural, human resource, political, and symbolic.

Bolman and Deal explain the meaning of each frame via metaphor. Factory or machine is the metaphor for a structural frame, and this frame “depicts a rational world and emphasizes organizational architecture, including planning, goals, structure, technology, specialized roles, coordination, formal relationships, and metrics” (15). Family is the metaphor for the human resource frame, and from this view, “the key challenge is to tailor organizations to individuals” (16). The jungle is the metaphor for the political frame, and this frame “sees organizations as arenas, contests, or jungles” (16). Finally, the carnival/temple/theater is the metaphor for the symbolic frame, which depicts “organizations as cultures, propelled by rituals, ceremonies, stories, heroes, and myths rather than by rules, policies, and managerial authority” (16).

Two articles provide a pithy explanation of reframing from an academic library perspective. The first is “Reframing Techniques and Managing Change within the Library Setting” by Alison J. Head and Kathleen Brown. The first half of the article provides a summary of *Reframing Organizations* and how the process of reframing can benefit a reorganization effort. The second half of the article is a hypothetical situation in which a library is “forced to take immediate steps to cut their operating costs by

30 percent” (Head and Brown 1995, 8). The authors then analyze the impact and change process through the four frames. They conclude that “although the reframing technique may not always lead managers to see their organizations from different perspectives that create a harmonious whole, the technique allows library managers to respond to change by using a contemplative methodology” (11).

A second article about reframing in libraries is Steven Sowell’s “Building a New Paradigm: Analysis of a Case Study in Organizational Change in Collection Management Using Bolman’s and Deal’s Four-Frame Model” (Sowell 2014). This 2014 article is a case study of the Oregon State University Libraries reorganization, and, in particular, the creation of the Collections & Resource Sharing Department (CRSD). Sowell uses the four-frame model not to inform a reorganization strategy, but to analyze a reorganization after the fact. The insights gained from Sowell’s article can help leaders of change structure reorganizations within their own unit or library. In his literature review of organizations, Sowell points out that “although one can examine reorganizations from multiple frames, one frame, usually implicitly, tends to dominate: the structural frame” (Sowell 2014, 214). Later on in a discussion of the OSU Libraries reorganization, Sowell states that “the decision to co-locate the acquisitions and interlibrary loan units came out of viewing the problem from a structural frame” (219). Sowell then provides a fuller picture of the OSU Libraries reorganization by showing how the decision to appoint the head of this new unit was based on the human resources frame. Not only did OSU Libraries have a failed search, but the individual chosen to lead the new unit was a capable manager looking to take on broader responsibilities. Sowell then analyzes the creation of a task force to develop space plans and a staff move through a political frame. The choice of members was political, for they needed to have good interpersonal communication skills and represent different constituencies in order to legitimize their recommendations. Sowell’s article then concludes about the importance of examining a reorganization through a symbolic and political frame, along with the structural, in order to better accomplish their change.

## **Library Reorganization - The 5 Steps**

The authors found a clear commonality in how libraries moved through their reorganization and change, as described in the case studies in the literature. Although the drivers, the timing, or planning methods may have been different, there were common stages undertaken to identify, design, and enable a change. Those stages are listed below. While an organization may not progress through the stages in a linear fashion, it will address every stage as it moves through the change process.

- 1) Spur/driver for change. Internal or external influencing factors precipitate the need for change.
- 2) Analysis and Diagnosis. Analyzing the current state of the organization and diagnosing what changes need to be made to address the influencing factors.
- 3) Communicating the change plan. Building consensus and overcoming resistance through clear and open communication. Allowing feedback loops to assess feasibility of change, realign change plans if appropriate.
- 4) Implementing the change. Moving forward with a plan for change, including support for acquiring new skills, and transitioning into new roles.
- 5) Continuous assessment. Constant evaluation to assess the success and sustainability of the change. This continuous assessment may lead back to the first stage as the organization continually evolves to meet the changing environment.

This section will provide a description of each of these stages with examples from the literature to illustrate how the change process has worked in documented library reorganizations.

### **Drivers for Change**

This is the beginning point of any change and reorganization. The drivers, which can be external or internal to the organization, require the organization to act to address the impacts of these factors. The literature describes a myriad of drivers that libraries point to as precipitating change, but it is usually a confluence of factors, not just one issue, which moves a library to the change point. This article will not provide a detailed review of factors impacting libraries and driving their change, but it will briefly describe in broad strokes the themes seen regularly in the literature.

Foremost in any discussion of drivers for change is technology. Technology has significantly impacted every facet of libraries over the last few decades: “The revolution in information technology, with dramatic increases in system functionality and performance, expanding volumes of information available electronically, rapid development in network connectivity and capacity, and sophisticated and powerful information searching and analysis tools, is producing unprecedented opportunities for service enhancements and eroding barriers to information access.” (Neal and Steele 1994, 85).

Technology has impacted how collections are built. Libraries have steadily moved their primary collecting format to electronic in response to the needs and priorities of faculty and researchers (Tenopir 2003, 42). This has resulted in several ripple effects as the roles and skills associated with the selection, acquisition, and management of collections have changed. Technical service areas are often a prime focus for change and reorganization. At the University of Carleton they describe why this is the case: “a typical pattern is that the library has seen a dramatic reduction in the number of staff working in collections and technical services overall—often through retirement and attrition—at the same time as e-resources started to gain ascendancy, but for various reasons there has not been the necessary reorganization of staff in order to cope with these two changes” (Miller, Sharp, and Jones 2014, 111).

Outside of technical services the liaison/subject specialist role is also being impacted by technological evolution. The business models for acquiring electronic content have moved selection away from item by

item. Big deal packages, patron driven acquisition, and electronic book bundles have moved selection up to the macro-level significantly diminishing this traditional function of the liaison role (Levine-Clark 2014). Additionally, as users discover, interact with, and reuse information in new ways, other traditional aspects of the role such as reference and instruction become less central. Libraries are initiating change and reorganization around these evolving liaison roles (Andrade and Zaghoul 2010). The work of Jaguszewski and Williams describes the changing emphases for these roles: “the overarching framework for all changes is an increasing focus on what users do (research, teaching, and learning) rather than on what librarians do (collections, reference, library instruction)” (Jaguszewski and Williams 2013, 4).

Another ripple effect from the migration to electronic collections is the growing emphasis on libraries as place. Patrons no longer need to visit the library to access physical collections, and libraries no longer view their primary function as a repository of print materials. At the University of Arizona the Dean stated that her library should shift “from a focus on "housing and storage of materials" to one of provision of "access to information" via the new technologies” (Diaz and Pintozzi 1999, 27). When the University of Carleton undertook renovations of their library building, it was explicitly articulated that space for print materials and shelving would not be any kind of focus in the changes (Miller, Sharp, and Jones 2014). Instead libraries are taking the opportunity to create a democratic place on campus that provides a technologically enhanced environment for learning, collaboration, creating, and research (Freeman 2005). Spaces freed by declining print are being reimagined in support of 21st century learning methodologies which in turn create the need for re-imagined roles and new skills, significant drivers for change (Turner, Welch, and Reynolds 2013).

The literature clearly reflects that declining budgets are a common impetus for change, as libraries focus on being “good stewards of scarce resources” (Ellis et al 2014) and seeking efficiencies and realignments in all areas. In 2010 Oregon State University (OSU) was facing a shortfall of almost \$6 million in reductions in state support and another \$9 million in statewide budget reductions”(Chadwell and Nichols

2010, 274). The university asked all colleges and departments, as well as the libraries, to restructure in order to achieve efficiencies. An extensive realignment review process was undertaken to consolidate workflows and reduce department heads, thereby decreasing salaries and anticipating retirements. As a result “the Libraries reduced units from 8 to 7. In the coming years, after a couple of anticipated retirements this will decrease to 5 units” (276).

Finally, one other driver for change that appeared often in the literature was the arrival of a new leader in the organization. These new leaders bring a fresh perspective and different contexts that quickly translate into change planning in the organization. At the University of Southern California, the new Dean very quickly signaled her intent for change: “during her first week, the dean announced that the library would, over the next four months, develop a strategic plan that would guide the operations of the libraries over the next 12–18 months” (Quinlan and McHarg 2012, 150). At the University of Arizona, the new Director signaled her intent for change before even taking the position: “Carla Stoffle, then Assistant Director of Libraries at the University of Michigan, accepted the post on a number of conditions. Two of these stand out as critical to the understanding of the direction the library would soon take: (1) that the university fund a new state-of-the-art online system, and (2) that Stoffle be allowed to do a study of the library's aged and top-heavy organizational structure to determine what could be done to improve it to save costs and improve services” (Diaz and Pintozzi 1999, 27).

### Analysis and Diagnosis

In this stage, the library begins to assess and understand its current state and develop a plan to address the need for change. This stage is crucial to understanding the local context, and it is often complemented by a broader environmental scan of libraries to identify trends, challenges, and issues that are facing others in similar situations. This stage is usually led by a task force or committee, or it is assigned to upper levels of library administration.

The library at the University of Minnesota formed a task force: “after a pivotal opening session with a consultant from the Association of Research Libraries, the group began an intensive learning process, reading extensively about restructuring in business and higher education, along with current literature on organizational development research. The readings provided the basis for early discussions about different organizational models and approaches, always with a focus on what would work best at Minnesota.” (Bowers et al 1996, 135). To assess the current state of their organization at Minnesota, “the task force decided to conduct an Employee Attitudes Survey” (136). They also undertook focus groups in which “staff members candidly shared information and ideas on their perceptions of the current organization, its values, barriers to the delivery of service to students and faculty, and what they want to see changed in the University Libraries” (137). Once the diagnosis and analysis was completed, “the task force began pulling together all the data gathered over the preceding six months. It was time to build models and commit to a plan” (138).

At Oregon State University Libraries (OSUL), “department heads were asked to provide articles that focused on the future of collections, services, and space or other relevant topics that could inform our realignment discussion” (Nutefall and Chadwell 2012, 163). Additionally, an OSU realignment reading packet was created to provide background and context for all involved. As the OSU process moved forward the Associate University Librarians (AULs) led their analysis and diagnosis stage: “the AULs met several times to discuss potential realignment models, focusing their discussions on assumptions related to organizational development and asking what might shape or influence the future organizational development of OSUL and academic libraries in general. The AULs also outlined what activities librarians and library staff might pursue more frequently in the future as a part of their regular responsibilities. Activities include instruction, outreach, assessment, scholarly communication, digital publishing, and working with metadata. The outcome of these meetings was a list of activities with broader descriptions that led to a preliminary list of possible unit configurations and missions”(165).

Subsequent planning exercise expanded to include the Library Administration, Management, and Planning Team (LAMP). They undertook visioning exercises to identify a “list of ten services or activities the group considered a priority in the next five to ten years” and to “imagine what the OSUL organizational structure might look like and act like in the next three to five years”(166, 167). Feedback was reviewed and the LAMP members identified significant areas of focus for OSUL moving forward and proposed six departments to carry that out. These recommendations were sent to the UL and AULs who finalized an organizational structure to best carry the organization forward.

At the University of Arizona, the Library Dean charged a “task force made up of a variety of levels of library staff and faculty with looking at what the library would have to do to thrive in the future as a vital institution within the academic community and to recommend an organizational structure that would best meet the library's future needs” (Diaz and Pintozzi 1999, 28). The task force undertook readings and discussions to identify principles that would guide the process and ultimately identified two models as potential paths forward.

### Communicating the Change Plan

In the analysis and diagnosis stage the change plan is identified. The next stage is communicating that plan to build consensus and support for the upcoming change as well as address the inevitable resistance from some staff. As Clack states, “the glue of an organizational development process is communication. Staff are responsible for creating and utilizing formal and informal communication networks. Appropriate timing and comprehensiveness of communiqués explaining strategic objectives are important organizational values” (Clack 1993, 39). At the University of Minnesota, library leaders had to deal with the charge that the task force’s communication did not have sufficient content: “this is a common criticism within organizations, perhaps largely due to unverified assumptions that individuals on each end of the communication channel make. There is a tendency to think that if one doesn't hear what one wants

to hear, one is not being communicated to. A clear understanding of what is to be communicated, as well as how that communication is to be done, is needed if a successful channel is to be established” (Bowers et al 1996, 143).

In our literature review we saw that the communication stage is often combined with the analysis and diagnosis. Gathering information on the current state of your organization and the broader experience of other libraries through focus groups, surveys, and environmental scans helps those involved see the need for change, communicate their thoughts and opinions, and feel included in identifying the path forward. This helps build consensus and minimizes resistance. For example at the University of Southern California (USC), the Dean created a small planning group to lead their planning process. The Dean utilized library-wide forums to facilitate library-wide open communication and feedback: “these forums were held every three weeks and generally focused on developing the various aspects of the plan: vision, mission, objectives” (Quinlan and McHarg 2012, 150). At the University of Dayton, “input from all library staff was solicited by electronic mail and through staff meetings. A restructuring workshop, led by an outside consultant and attended by the entire library staff, was held to clarify the library’s goals and elicit further staff input” (Courtney and Jenkins 1998, 289).

The University of Arizona Dean of the Libraries, when presented by her planning team with two potential organizational models, “realized early on that any move toward changing the structure of the organization would require a great deal of support and buy-in from staff, asked staff to choose which model to adopt. The Dean extended this strategy of staff involvement into subsequent phases in the process of creating the new organization” (Diaz and Pintozzi 1999, 28). It was also noted that “constant formal communication about the process and high levels of staff participation were key to maintaining staff interest and involvement in the various phases of the restructuring. In all, over seventy out of two hundred staff participated in some phase of the restructuring” (28).

## Implementing the Change

After deciding what needs to be done to enact positive change and communicating the purpose and goals for change, the next stage is to make that change happen. If staff are transitioning to new roles, it is essential that they are supported through that transition with training and skills acquisition. Assessing the aptitude for new roles should be an integral part of the process. At the University of Texas at Arlington, the Dean implemented a “Knowledge, Skills, Abilities, and Preferences/Passions (KSAP) self-assessment tool to help match staff with positions during the reorganization process” (Chamberlain and Reece 2014, 250). The KSAP enabled staff to identify their strengths and weaknesses which were then mapped to available and new positions that had resulted from the organizational restructuring: “for example, the KSAP statement asking staff members to assess how much they enjoyed teaching in person would be mapped to any positions that would require staff to offer face-to face instruction” (250).

Support through training and regular communication is also an understood facet of effective change. At the University of Arizona, as they worked towards a team based organization, they noted the importance of ongoing and relevant training: “training and other staff development opportunities have played a major role in educating library staff about teams, customer service, process improvement, and total quality management, as well as in preparing all staff members to be proactive, empowered members of a team-based organization. Each year, generous amounts of funding have been available for in-house workshops, for staff attendance at conferences and workshops outside the library, and for in-house resource materials” (Diaz and Pintozzi 1999, 30). At Minnesota, another library trying to effect a team based structure, they saw that “teamwork does not simply ‘happen’ and it was necessary for the group to learn to trust the process or teamwork” (Bowers et al 1996, 140-141).

## Continuous assessment.

Assessing the success and sustainability of any reorganization or change process is vital to continued success. Understanding if the change was effective, if it is organizationally established, or if it needs to be realigned as new factors influence the organization should be embedded into the process. Change should be “expected to be a continuous state, and those libraries treating it as such are likely to be better prepared to respond to emerging opportunities” (Maloney et al 2010, 335).

Oregon State University Libraries laments a failing to undertake effective assessment in their reorganization: “as with any change, assessment is key to knowing its success. Establishing indicators of success for the realignment and then conducting follow-up would have provided valuable input for future processes. More follow-up with department heads and librarians on the realignment should have been done to indicate their understanding of the process and what worked” (Nutefall and Chadwell 2012, 171). With this note OSUL indicates to other organizations how key the assessment stage is.

At Arizona, they recognized the need for assessment and are using strategic goals as a benchmark: “the whole library and individual teams have created strategic and annual plans for the past two years and are measuring success as progress toward accomplishment of work outlined in those plans” (Diaz and Pintozzi 1999, 34). At Indiana they also see a value to aligning assessment of reorganization with their strategic plan and goals: “at the IU Libraries we are integrating the strategic planning, quality, and review processes to establish an approach which will assure a highly responsive and effective operation. Each of these elements adds dimension and strength to the others” (Neal and Steele 1994, 92).

### **UNLV Libraries – A Division Reorganization Through the 5 Steps**

The Logistics, Resources, and Distribution Services (LRDS) division is made up of three departments and twenty-three staff, of whom ten hold library faculty status. The division is responsible for a broad set of functions which break down across departments as follows:

- Collection Management Department: collection development, acquisitions (all formats), Inter-Library Loan
- Discovery Department: cataloging and metadata, e-resource management
- Digital Scholarship Strategy Department: administration and support of the university's institutional repository.

The division plays a vital function in the university's and libraries' teaching, research, and community engagement missions by acquiring, organizing, maintaining, and making discoverable all needed and relevant materials.

### LRDS Reorganization Steps

The LRDS reorganization, informed at later stages by the literature, adhered to the five stages described in the previous section.

### *Drivers for Change*

The LRDS division has been through a variety of reorganizations, scope changes and subsequent name changes over recent years. As a result knowledge and consistency have been lost through repeated staff reassignments, staff retirements and changing workflows. A new division director arrived in October 2013, the sixth director of the division in seven years, bringing some new perspectives and “fresh eyes” to the division.

### *Analysis and Diagnosis*

Upon arrival the director spent a period of time assessing workflows, processes, and skills and identified several issues that needed to be addressed. The LRDS division had a skilled staff and was efficient, but there were several areas of concern. Those areas were communication, follow through, ownership and cross training and backup.

The division director then led several information gathering exercises and discussions with the division to identify ways to tackle these areas of concern. In addition, a retreat and subsequent follow-up meetings with the division management team, consisting of the division director and the three department heads, were held. The outcome of these activities was the decision to reorganize the division. It was felt that a reorganization that emphasized the full lifecycle of a resource within one department would help address the identified concerns.

### *Communicating and Implementing the Change Plan*

It was an intentional decision not to go back to the division staff with the proposed reorganization and invite comment. It was felt that staff had been able to provide critical input and information along the way and asking for feedback that may not be acted upon could cause unnecessary frustrations. Instead the division director created a document that detailed the reasons for change, the processes by which the decisions were made and the next steps moving forward. This document was distributed to the division and was used for discussion at a division wide meeting to clarify questions and concerns about the upcoming changes. Staff were invited to ask questions or voice concerns about the transition and their roles in it. Staff were receptive to the new structure and indicated their readiness to work together to make it successful.

Department heads worked on transition plans identifying which tasks would transition, to whom and when, using three transition timelines - immediate (0 – 3 months) , mid-range (3 – 9 months) and long – term (9 months – onwards). Communication about the new divisional structure to division staff started with one-on –one meetings with those staff who would be impacted by the change with either new reporting lines, additional responsibilities or new tasks. The transition timelines were a key tool in these meeting to illustrate that change would be a phased process and no staff member would be expected to immediately pick up new assignments. Training and support would be a priority as the division moved forward in the new structure.

### *Continuous Assessment*

The new organizational structure was put in place in early Fall 2014 and has been working well. Aspects of the transition plans are still being worked through but overall staff are responding to their new tasks, learning new skills and sharing their knowledge with each other to create a stronger more effective and efficient division.

### **Conclusion**

Comparing the library literature on reorganizations with *Leading Change* and *Reframing Organizations*, we see that libraries are already doing many of the recommended actions needed to implement successful change. Using Kotter's model, many libraries have established a sense of urgency by identifying a need for change, whether it be technology, the changing roles and needs of the library, or the arrival of a new leader. Most libraries also create a guiding coalition, usually a task force, which helps create and communicate the vision of the change. The continuous assessment that many libraries undertake is part of institutionalizing new approaches; in other words, continuous assessment means that the libraries are looking to make change a continuous state and part of their culture.

However, we noted that some significant actions recommended by *Leading Change* and *Reframing Organizations* were not well utilized in the library reorganization process. For example, according to Stephen Sowell, the structural frame, that is how a library could be organized, is the predominant frame for making sense of an organization. The other frames - the human resource, political, and symbolic - are touched upon or not addressed at all (Sowell 2014). The University of Minnesota library, however, is an exception that incorporated a human resource frame to the analysis and diagnosis stage. By conducting an Employee Attitudes Survey and following it up with focus groups where staff can talk freely, the leaders of this library gained a more complete picture of the organization that allowed them to effectively build models and plan for change (Bowers et al 1996). The USC library is another institution that utilized

the human resource frame by holding forum discussions to help improve morale and gather input on next steps in the change process (Quinlan and McHarg 2012). Implicitly, these discussions at Minnesota and USC were also political in nature, for they attempted to induce the buy-in and ownership of the change process by giving staff a say in the direction of the projects.

Another recommended action missing from the library literature was the sixth stage of Kotter's eight-stage process - planning for and creating short-term wins. In *Leading Change*, Kotter states that reorganizations could take lots of time to come to fruition. Short-term wins demonstrate to employees ambivalent about the reorganization that change is working. Short-term wins thus help leaders build credibility to sustain efforts over the long haul (Kotter 1996, 119). Kotter then provides three characteristics of a short-term win - it is visible, it is unambiguous, and "it's clearly related to the change effort" (122). Once achieved, these short-term wins need to be celebrated and rewarded to keep up morale and belief in the reorganization efforts.

No reorganization is perfect. Today's solution may be outdated tomorrow depending on factors external or internal. Although libraries change to meet tomorrow's challenges, "change undermines existing structural arrangements, creating ambiguity, confusion, and distrust" (Bolman and Deal 2013, 381). Change has the potential to be a disruptive force in an organization, and libraries must endeavor to create a process around their change that clarifies, communicates, and facilitates full participation and continued assessment. Our study shows that libraries are largely creating that process themselves without reference to the management theory, guided instead by their "natural instincts" and local context. Our study shows that this will likely be a successful strategy if all the five steps described in the article are covered. However, the authors do believe that consulting a relevant management model such as Kotter's eight steps should be part of every reorganization effort to help a library understand what it is about to undertake and to provide frame and process to guide the change.

## References

- Andrade, Ricardo, and Raik Zaghoul. 2010. "Restructuring Liaison Librarian Teams at the University of Arizona Libraries." *New Library World* 111 (7-8): 273-286.
- Bolman, Lee G., and Terrence E. Deal. 2013. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*, 5th ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bowers, Matthew, Linda DeBeau-Melting, JoAnn DeVries and Merry Schellinger. 1996. "Organizational Restructuring in Academic Libraries." *Journal of Library Administration* 22 (2-3): 133-144.
- Chadwell, Faye A. and Jane Nichols. 2010. "The 'Get It' Department: Oregon State University's Strategic Realignment of Collection Services." *Proceedings of the Charleston Library Conference: 273-285.*
- Chamberlain, Clint and Derek Reece. 2014. "Library Reorganization, Chaos, and Using the Core Competencies as a Guide." *The Serials Librarian: From the Printed Page to the Digital Age* 66 (1-4): 248-252.
- Clack, Mary Elizabeth. 1993. "Organizational Development and TQM." *Journal of Library Administration* 18 (1-2): 29-43.
- Courtney, Nancy and Fred W. Jenkins. 1998. "Reorganizing Collection Development and Acquisitions in a Medium-Sized Academic Library." *Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory* 22 (3): 287-293.
- Diaz, Joseph R. and Chestalene Pintozzi. 1999. "Helping Teams Work Lessons Learned from the University of Arizona Library Reorganization." *Library Administration & Management* 13 (1): 27-36.
- Ellis, Erin L., Brian Rosenblum, John Stratton, and Kathleen Ames-Stratton. 2014. "Positioning Academic Libraries for the Future: A Process and Strategy for Organizational Transformation." *Proceedings of the IATUL Conferences 2014.*
- Freeman, Geoffrey T. 2005. *The Library as Place: Changes in Learning Patterns, Collections, Technology, and Use*. Washington DC: Council on Library and Information Resources.
- Head, Alison J. and Kathleen Brown. 1995. "Reframing Techniques and Managing Change within the Library Setting." *Journal of Library Administration* 22 (1): 1-12.
- Jaguszewski, Janice and Karen Williams. 2013. *New Roles for New Times: Transforming Liaison Roles in Research Libraries*. Washington DC: Association of Research Libraries.
- Kotter, John P. 1995. "Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail." *Harvard Business Review* 73 (2): 59-67.
- Kotter, John P. 1996. *Leading Change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Levine-Clark, Michael. 2014. "Access to Everything: Building the Future Academic Library Collection." *Libraries and the Academy* 14 (3): 425-437.

- Maloney, Krisellen, Kristin Antelman, Kenning Arlitsch, and John Butler. 2010. "Future Leaders' Views on Organizational Culture." *College & Research Libraries* 71 (4): 322-345.
- Miller, Laura Newton, David Sharp and Wayne Jones. 2014. "70% and Climbing: E-Resources, Books, and Library Restructuring." *Collection Management* 39 (2-3): 110-126.
- Neal, James G. and Patricia A. Steele. 1994. "Empowerment, Organization and Structure: The Experience of the Indiana University Libraries." *Journal of Library Administration* 19 (3-4): 81-96.
- Nutefall, Jennifer E. and Faye A. Chadwell. 2012. "Preparing for the 21st Century Academic Library Realignment." *New Library World* 113 (3-4): 162-173.
- Quinlan Catherine and Hugh McHarg. 2012. "The Emerging Library: Structure, Culture, and Lessons Learned from the Dissolution of a Combined Libraries-IT Organization." *Journal of Library Administration* 52 (2): 147-161.
- Soehner, Catherine B. 2015. "Leading Change in Libraries: A Case Study." *Library Leadership & Management* 29 (2): 1-7.
- Sowell, Steven. 2014. "Building a New Paradigm: Analysis of a Case Study in Organizational Change in Collection Management Using Bolman's and Deal's Four-Frame Model." *Collection Management* 39 (2-3): 211-226.
- Tenopir, Carol. 2003. *Use and Users of Electronic Library Resources: An Overview and Analysis of Recent Research Studies*. Washington DC: Council on Library and Information Resources.
- Turner, Arlee, Bernadette Welch and Sue Reynolds. 2013. "Learning Spaces in Academic Libraries – A Review of the Evolving Trends." *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 44 (4): 226-234.