Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Education and Training for Library Management

ROBERT P. HOLLEY, Column Editor
Professor Emeritus of Library and Information Science, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA

Column Editor's Note. *This* JLA *column will consider issues of education and training for management positions in libraries and other information organizations from the perspectives of both the provider and the recipient. The column will appear in odd-numbered issues of the journal and focus on management education/training at various stages of the individual's career including the effectiveness of these efforts, their content, and the specific challenges of teaching and learning within the field of librarianship. The column will address both theoretical and practical concerns. Prospective authors are invited to submit articles for this column to the editor at aa3805@wayne.edu*

ACADEMIC LIBRARY MANAGEMENT: CASE STUDIES, EDITED BY DEARIE, METH, AND WESTBROOKS: A SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

ABSTRACT. *Case studies can be an excellent way to teach management principles. This article presents a detailed analysis of the fourteen case studies included in Academic Library Management: Case Studies, edited by Tammy Nickelson Dearie, Michael Meth, and Elaine L. Westbrooks. The authors of the case studies participated in the 2014 UCLA Senior Fellows program, directed by Beverly Lynch, and prepared these case studies as a way to fill a void in the professional management literature. The article summarizes the management problem in each case study*

Address correspondence to Robert P. Holley, Professor Emeritus of Library and Information Science, 106 Kresge Library, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI 48202, USA. E-mail: aa3805@wayne.edu

and the actions taken to resolve it. This analysis also includes a critique of the case studies as appropriate including additional information that would make the case study stronger, the author's opinion on the veracity of the account, commentary on the choice of the management principles, particularly strong or weak points, and further lessons that could be drawn from the case study. The article concludes with some general observations on this type of case study and its potential use in teaching library management.

INTRODUCTION

Case studies are one way to teach management principles. To investigate their potential value, I provide below a detailed analysis of 14 case studies that appeared in a recent book, *Academic Library Management: Case Studies*, edited by Tammy Nickelson Dearie, Michael Meth, and Elaine L. Westbrooks, published by Neal-Schuman, Chicago, 2018, ISBN 978-0-8389-1559-2. The authors of the 14 case studies participated in the 2014 UCLA Senior Fellows program, directed by Beverly Lynch. The participants wished to "contribute to the profession" and agreed with Lynch's suggestion to collect their "experiences and stories in case study format so that others in academic libraries could learn how [they] approached and solved problems." The participants "noted the absence of case studies written specifically for … academic libraries" and hoped that "this book will fill the void."

In teaching management, I have encountered two types of case studies. The current volume, for the most part, recounts actual experiences with the goal of providing lessons for effective management. The case studies allow the reader to see how the librarians grappled with specific problems and to learn what succeeded and what did not in an attempt to reach satisfactory solutions. A good case study of this type will go beyond the specifics of the problem to illustrate general principles of wider applicability to academic library management.

In comparison, the second type of case study has a more focused pedagogical goal of presenting readers with a problem to be solved without necessarily providing the answer. The authors of such case studies create a fictional situation. This freedom allows the creation of a case study

where the reader or student must take into account complex factors and conflicting management principles. The case study author may even provide subtle misdirection to tempt the reader to choose a simple, but less effective solution. An examination of this type of case study is worthy of a future column.

I provide below a review of each of the 14 case studies. Beyond a discussion of the problem and its solution, this analysis can include different elements as appropriate including additional information that would make the case study stronger, my opinion on the veracity of the account, commentary on the choice of the management principles, particularly strong or weak points, and additional lessons that could be drawn from the case study. The article concludes with some general observations on this type of case study.

THE CASE STUDIES

Effective Shared Governance in Academic Libraries. Charles Lyons, H. Austin Booth, and Scott Hollander

The University at Buffalo (UB) Libraries underwent a major reorganization in February 2015, in part to implement greater shared governance. The authors relate the reasons for the reorganization, the process, and "looking to the future." After trying to meet the challenge of defining shared governance, the case study identifies the three primary groups: administration, librarian faculty, and staff. I did not get the sense that the reorganization was undertaken to deal with a crisis but to recognize changes in research libraries and on the UB campus. The new organization replaced a complex mishmash of varying job titles with overlapping duties. The new structure has four associate university librarians in charge of Discovery and Delivery; Research, Education, and Outreach; Technology; and Administration and the head of the Law Library whose duties remained the same.

One of the first major challenges would be—Who would approve the reorganization? The provost ruled that UB libraries was an administrative unit rather than an academic unit, hence the Faculty Senate need not to be involved even if the librarians had faculty status. As the UB Libraries decided to fill the positions internally, the authors provided an excellent commentary on the advantages and disadvantages of doing so. They do the same in examining why some staff did not want to participate in the new shared governance. While bringing up the issue of the increased time that shared governance requires, the authors do not clearly state whether they consider this to be a problem or not in running an effective library.

Lessons from the reorganization include the need to clarify roles. An effort to "divvy up duties and assign authority levels" was abandoned "because those approaches essentially produced divided, not shared, governance." In the end, the librarian Faculty Executive Committee took on the role of transmitting librarian concerns and acting as a sounding board. The case study ends with a difficult challenge of improving communication and making plans for implementing a strategic planning process. One important conclusion is that "conflict is a natural part of a healthy organization," but shared governance can help avoid negative consequences.

I have three questions about the case study. First, the authors never define the nature of faculty status at UB so that I do not know whether librarians are expected to publish, have release time to do so, and have any portion of the independence that traditional teaching faculty possess or whether the main evaluative factor is their performance of library duties. Second, I have concerns about the relatively minor role of staff in governance even after attempts by the authors to address this issue. Is shared governance working? Are administrators changing their decision-making behavior? Do librarians and staff feel as if they have a greater say in library operations? Were the end results worth the effort? Finally, teaching faculty have been criticized for using their greater role in governance to foster their self-interest. Are there any indications that the same is happening in the UB Libraries?

LibrariesForward: Strategic Planning in an Environment of Change. K. Megan Sheffield and M. H. Albro

Sheffield and Albro describe the process by the LibrariesForward committee to complete a strategic plan for the Clemson University libraries. Both Clemson University and the Libraries were dealing with "an unprecedented amount of change," including the hiring of a new dean for libraries. She wished to move quickly and appointed a committee in mid-November to deliver a completed document by February 2016. The short-time frame created the first challenge of achieving maximum efficiency while still consulting with all the library constituencies. The LibrariesForward committee included three librarians and three staff members from all parts of the libraries, which proved to be an excellent way to break down librarian-staff barriers. My one unanswered question in the case study is whether they were relieved of their regular duties to work solely on the strategic plan. They used online resources for frequent consultation with meetings saved for "hashing out serious issues." The second major challenge was that the library plan needed to be coordinated with any changes in the University's similar efforts, often on short notice.

The first draft of the document was discarded as being too prescriptive and replaced by one that focused more on outcomes than activities. Once a final draft was completed, the committee organized a library wide retreat at the suggestion of the dean where "employees would be offered a chance to provide feedback." As described, the retreat avoided efforts to sell the plan by limiting input from committee members to answering questions. The process also encouraged anonymous feedback. The comments led to the inclusion of some overlooked topics and the clarification of vague goals.

Overall, I believe that this case study provides an excellent model for completing a strategic plan quickly while still gathering input from all library employees by stressing "flexibility, communication, and focus." The two-step process was effective in having the small committee focus on gathering information and writing an initial draft and then fostering "employee buy-in among a group of people facing strategic planning fatigue" through consultation and the library-wide retreat. I also concur with the need to create a document that avoids both being too specific or too broad.

One University's Approach to Academic Library Funding: Developing an Appropriations Model for Stability. Brian W. Keith and Laura I. Spears

This case study describes how the Smathers Libraries at the University of Florida (UF) built a model in an attempt to increase the low level of library funding. The key issue is that library funding has increased much less than that of its peer and aspirational institutions. One reason for the potential success of this strategy is "the intent of the university to improve its overall rankings in acknowledged ranking systems."

The first dataset "focused on the relationship between library expenditures for UF and the three peer groups" identified for this study. The statistical analysis studied "the proportion of the difference in library expenditures that is predictable by differences in university expenditures." The end result showed "the unpredictably of library expenditures …." While the Florida Board of Governors had increased its support for Florida universities, UF had chosen to use most funds to attract high-profile faculty and to turn research into "commercial products or services that benefit a large, practical portion of Florida's communities." In other words, the university had the means to provide greater support for libraries but chose not to do so. The second dataset compares library resources with peers both as a whole and on a per faculty and per student basis. In both tables, UF received less support than its peers, often by a wide margin. This lack of support may impede the effectiveness of the current and newly hired faculty and make it more difficult for graduate students to complete their studies.

The final section on next steps does not assume that the conclusions above will lead to increased library funding. Instead, they suggest a need to "examine whether the disparity between university expenditures and library expenditures is related to the perceived value of the library to the university's mission." In other words, "the Libraries will benefit from more extensive self-assessment, outreach, and communication of core values that directly support the mission of the university."

I have many questions about this case study. I would find it useful to know if any historical reasons explain why the Smathers Libraries are underfunded as this knowledge would help to understand why current allocations are low. In addition, more detail on the budget process could determine whether the current analysis has any chance of leading to a higher allocation and who is the audience for these detailed statistics. The concluding section seems to indicate that the two data analyses would not make much difference. In the same vein, perhaps faculty and students are content with available resources and are able to meet their teaching, learning, and research needs with the current level of funding. The contemporary philosophy of collection development emphasizes having access to information more than a count of volumes so that some of the resource comparisons are less compelling. In fact, many libraries are weeding their print collections to repurpose space to better serve users. Finally and most importantly, the final conclusion to examine how the library supports the university's mission does not need the analysis of the two datasets to justify its adoption as an excellent strategy to work toward increasing funding.

A Shared Collection and the Advancement of a Collaborative Future. Yolanda L. Cooper and Catherine L. Murray-Rust

The focus of this case study is building a Library Service Facility (LSF) by two research libraries that have a long history of cooperation. Overall, the process follows a series of predictable steps: identifying the problem, proposing ways to solve it, engaging the project management office, creating working groups, establishing an LSF steering committee, building the facility, and moving in. While disagreements arose during the process, the two libraries, one public and one private, "were able to openly communicate to reach workable solutions and compromise." The success of this project has led to exploring possible new areas for cooperation including cataloging, joint staffing, a shared digital repository, and coordinated collection development including collaborative negotiation of joint digital licenses.

A peculiar decision in writing the case study and others later in the volume was to hide the identities of the two libraries by calling them institution A and institution B. All it takes to unmask their identities is to consult the section "About the Editors and Contributors" to learn that Yolanda

Cooper is the university librarian at Emory University and that Catherine Murray-Rust is dean of Libraries at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

The final storage facility of 55,000 square feet provides state-of-the-art features for collection preservation and also a reading room for on-site use. After the initial move, the LSF held 1,629,000 volumes with plenty of room for expansion. One fact that emphasized the decline in importance of print collections is that Institution B moved 95% of its collection into storage at the LSF. Perhaps, the fact that the LSF is reasonably close to both libraries made this an easier choice.

Three facts caught my eye. First, collection overlap was only 17%, lower than I would have expected. This figure reduces any savings from weeding the two collections to keep only one copy. Second, one complication in staffing the LSF was the varying personnel policies and the differing status of librarians. To simplify matters, Institution B is the employer of record for all employees at the LSF. On the other side, Institution A "agreed to handle all technology and information networks as well as building management and security for the facility," in part because the LSF is located on its property. Finally, hiring the LSF director was challenging and required posting the position three times. Whether the reason was difficulty in finding the needed credentials or salary requirements for the position is not stated.

Surprisingly, the authors do not discuss user reactions on campus, especially faculty, to the LSF. Putting materials into storage has been a contentious decision at institutions such as Cornell University and the New York Public Library. What efforts, if any, were made to sell the concept and to keep the campus community aware of developments? The case study also does not include the cost of the LSF and how funding was obtained. In this era of budget scarcity, how were the funds allocated and what was the justification for the expenditure? I would suspect that freeing up space was an especially important consideration. The case study does explain how the two institutions used an existing cooperative organization to legally handle the supervision of the project and then leased back the facility to the two universities, but this creative solution also raises questions about its future financial relationship with its owners.

Form Follows Function: Creating a New Liaison Model. Amy Harris Houk and Kathryn M. Crowe

The reduced importance of consulting faculty about collection development decisions coupled with an increasing emphasis on "special collections, information literacy, student learning, and the access to discovery of information" prodded the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNCG) to examine its liaison model. The task force, appointed in 2012, recommended three possible models. The collection development model

would create a department that would reduce the amount of time liaisons spent on collection development and allow them to focus on teaching and consultations. The subject team model would create a new liaison department and three subject teams: humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. The functional team model would eliminate the traditional liaison model and replace it with teams responsible for an area like scholarly communication or the first year experience. The end result was a hybrid structure of three subject teams and four functional teams (collections, scholarly communication, instruction, and reference desk).

During the first year of a two-year planned implementation, so much happened with so many meetings and so much communication among the groups that I had trouble following who was doing what. Two important activities occurred during the second year. The first was creating an updated document that defined liaison roles to serve as a guide for current and future liaisons and as a marketing tool to faculty. The second was implementing more effective decision-making within the teams on how to distribute duties when a member leaves or joins the team.

The case study provides three lessons about what could have been done differently. They all involved communication including greater input from and participation by paraprofessionals and librarians in other library departments plus "enhanced communication with the entire library staff about the process." The authors attribute the success of the new model to the fact that "the motivation and impetus to reorganize came from the bottom up as well as the top down." My one serious concern about this straightforward case study is the lack of any input or evaluation from faculty, the main group served by the liaisons. Some feedback on how they preferred to interact with the library and their opinions about what support services would be most valuable for them would seem to be important information in creating a new liaison model.

Using a Project Management Methodology to Reorganize Technical Services. Lisa O'Hara and Les Moor

The reorganization of technical services became a high priority in 2015 when an imbalance of staff between processing print resources and electronic resources created a crisis. While the university is not named, a quick check in the contributor section identifies it as the University of Manitoba. The reorganization into four teams (Electronic Resource Setup, Subscription Management, Receiving and Metadata, and Ordering and Activations) had goals of more evenly distributing work and eliminating knowledge silos as each staff member would be a member of at least two teams. The first problem arose when staff were asked about their

preferred team assignments and most picked areas that they were most familiar with. To resolve this issue, members of the current Monographic team got their first choice, but the second assignment had to be to an electronic resources intensive team, a decision that worked against the goal for the reorganization of achieving improved job satisfaction.

For implementation, the library chose PRINCE2, a British project management methodology that was employed at a somewhat simplified level since this project "was considered in PRINCE2 Terms to be low risk, low cost, and confined to a single site." Phase 1 was basically starting up the project with rules for staff behavior, establishing responsibility for change, and determining how to report progress. Phase 2 established a formal process for getting tasks completed. Documentation was important to help novices understand their responsibilities with the added benefit that the new members sometimes came up with suggestions for change as they were looking at processes with fresh eyes. An unresolved issue was "seepage" where completion of a task required handing it off among multiple teams, an inefficient process that easily led to miscommunication. Phase 3 was closing the project. The project manager "confirmed that the objective of the project had been met" including tripling the number of staff dealing with electronic resources. An anonymous survey indicated that measures of job satisfaction were neutral but with both high positive and high negative changes reported.

Post-reorganization problems included how to identify which team should deal with a new issue, the fact that tasks assigned to each team looked arbitrary, and muddled supervisory responsibilities that, however, did not cause any practical problems. The library learned multiple lessons from the process. "The time and energy spent up front … paid huge dividends." Giving the staff the ability to make decisions had the result that they "worked to achieve the best outcomes." In addition, this empowerment facilitated changes and avoided bottlenecks caused by having a single person in total control.

The honesty of recounting both successes and failures made this case study particularly useful. I felt that the author was particularly upfront about what could have been done differently. I still, however, have two questions. The first is how the normal work of the library was accomplished during the reorganization as staff were so heavily involved in planning activities. Second, would the process have been improved by consulting other library staff and the library users about what was most important for them to make effective use of both print and electronic resources?

Triage Succession Planning: How Mass Turnover Required On-the-spot Mentoring. Sian Brannon

Brannon describes how she resolved the serious problems that she faced as a new manager of the collections department at the University of North Texas Libraries (name of the library discovered from the contributor biography). Demographics predicated a massive turnover in staff over the next few years. In addition, "little succession planning, cross-training, or documentation of institutional knowledge had been done." In addition, the current staff lacked important hard and soft skills. Finally, the staff lacked diversity with 88.5% Caucasian and 81% female.

With a start date of December 2010, she set a deadline of September 2011 "to have a succession plan in place." Her first steps were to gather information from both administrators and staff. She admits that she was not clear enough about the reasons for doing so and then had to counter the belief among staff "that their jobs were in danger." She and her department heads also discovered "a plethora of options for cooperating with other divisions in the library." She determined the type of employees that the library needed, "reorganized the structure of the divisions to align skill sets and job functions," and took practical steps to increase diversity.

Her next step was to systematically examine staffing needs by creating two tables. The first, "key existing positions and potential successors," included the retirement status of the incumbent, the position's "criticality" and "priority," and possible successors with an evaluation of their readiness for the position. The second listed "desired positions and potential candidates" including whether a current staff member was ready for promotion or transfer. A second step was identifying competencies in seven areas with emphasis on the "softer skills" that had long been overlooked in a division focused on expertise in technical matters. These findings were used to create "competency tables for each position" and to give a rating to "potential candidates." To increase the available skill set and expand future possibilities for advancement within the library, the final goal was to foster employee development. After a discussion of the potential results of traditional strategies such as training, a minor increase in responsibilities, and university courses, Brannon decided to favor partnering the employee with a strong mentor as "a more practical method of imparting skills." The final section deals with developments since the approval of the succession plan by the dean and a few major lessons learned from the succession planning efforts. In sum, the unit looks quite different from what it was when Brannon arrived.

This case study presents an example of a strong administrator who favors top-down management. Creating the plan in such a short time is impressive. I would, however, like to know how employees felt about changes and whether they gave any pushback, subtle or otherwise. I also

have other lingering questions. How well did she keep the dean informed during the planning and development stages? Were her direct reports competent as she does not comment on this important factor? Does she have any concrete evidence of how these planning efforts improved the performance of her unit? Did she survey the "customers" of her unit about what they wanted? Was she really able to "control how, when, and to whom certain information is communicated" as rumor mills are often exceptionally effective? In conclusion, this case study is based on the principle that manager knows best and the employee participation in decision-making is not all that important.

The Archivist Apprenticeship: Partnering with the Knowledge River Program Diversity Initiative. Maurita Baldock and Veronica Reyes-Escudero

This case study describes how partnership between the University of Arizona Library Special Collections (UALSC) and the Knowledge River (KR) became much more effective after UALSC staff participated in a review of a KR grant proposal to IMLS. This activity helped UALSC learn about KR's expected outcomes that had not been clear to them before. To describe the two participants, UALSC includes both Special Collections and archives. Knowledge River began in 2002 and is housed in the University of Arizona iSchool. "This program is one of the few successful initiatives in the country that works to increase the number of librarians from and interested in serving underrepresented groups." It focuses on Latino and Native American populations "because they reflect the diverse and often 'underserved populations' in Arizona and the Southwest."

During the first 3–4 years, KR's placement of graduate assistants (GAs) in Special Collections faced many obstacles. KR and the library administrative staff did not consult with special collections before making placements. Some GAs were not an appropriate fit for Special Collections and left after only one semester. They required extensive training during a period of limited staffing so that they most often performed menial tasks of less benefit to both the students and Special Collections. Without time for adequate supervision, "students were not always clear about workplace expectations and would often miss work without communicating the absences to their supervisors."

In 2010, the effectiveness of the cooperative venture improved on account of the collaboration between the Special Collections supervisors and the KR program manager on an IMLS grant proposal coupled with more staffing in Special Collections. Special Collections started to interview the GA candidates to determine fit and to identify any useful special skills, such as fluency in Spanish. The placement length was also

increased to one year. In return, Special Collections "developed a more comprehensive program that included training in the fundamentals of arrangement and description" that allowed the students to work on substantive projects. GAs also took part in a mentorship program with ongoing biweekly meetings.

The achievements from the improved partnership include presentations and poster sessions by GAs at conferences, the use of student work in exhibits, a weekly student blog, and a capstone presentation that is open to "library staff and faculty as well as funders, peers, and iSchool faculty." The placement rate for graduates is good. Special Collections have benefited from students with strong Spanish-language skills. Educating the Native American students "has opened doors for [Special Collections] to work with local Native American tribes regarding tribal materials [they] have in [their] collections." The main challenge in continuing these successful efforts to increase diversity in the field is that "the KR program relies on grant funding and because [their] students' wages and employee-related expenses are paid by outside donors."

One Incident of Violence, or, It Will Never Be the Same.
Kathleen Delong

This case study has a chilling start: "As soon as I walked into the main door, I saw the blood on the floor." A knifing occurred on the third floor of the Taylor Library at the University of Alberta Libraries and turned out to be "a targeted and gang-related incident." The two staff on duty at the circulation desk handled the situation appropriately by calling Campus Security. The city police also arrived and went from floor to floor to ask students to leave. The two staff members and three students witnesses were taken to the dean's office to give evidence. Staff were given a chance to talk to a counselor. The next day, a counselor and a member from campus security talked to the full staff. Overall, the incident was handled well and should have ended there; but it did not. The sense of security was broken so that staff became reluctant to work alone or during evening hours. "There is no rationale or policy that will fill the void" caused by this change in perception.

Unlike other case studies, the author then provides "questions for discussion" for the reader about emergencies and dealing with the aftermath. The case study concludes with key learning points including stressing the unpredictability of any such event even if preparations for dealing with emergencies exist. Using a loudspeaker to ask patrons to leave would have obstructed the exit points of the six-story building with one stairwell already blocked off. "Stories and rumors were rampant" as "it was very difficult to know what happened." Two key library administrators were

unavailable. The one suggestion for improvement was keeping all library staff, even in other buildings, more informed of developments even if the incident posed no danger to them. In the end, the sense of security "will never be the same" even if time will "dull the edge of feeling." I have only one question. As this library is located in an area where violence is relatively rare, I wonder if the effect would be different for a library in an area known for its high crime where staff might be more familiar with such events.

A Phased Approach to Creating Updated User Spaces.
Michael Crumpton

I give high marks to this case study for its excellent description of a comprehensive plan, created in 2008, to update user spaces. This initiative changed the library from a warehouse to a user-centered institution and achieved this goal within the constraints of limited resources. The original objective was to complete the transition in five phases that each would cost approximately $1 million. While plans had to be modified to meet changes in user needs and resource availability, the importance of consulting library stakeholders at each step was a key component to obtaining the maximum value from each separate project. Slower change over an extended period "allowed for continuous improvement as well as an analysis of what was learned in the process of assessment and environmental scanning."

The library is the University of North Carolina at Greensboro (UNC Greensboro) whose faculty liaison structure was studied in an earlier case study. The original library, built in 1950, was considered a model for library construction at the time. In the first decade of the 21st century, the library was now, however, seen as old and outdated with no room for more books and for any expansion of Special Collections. The library was unable to meet the demand for general and collaborative study space. Scheduling the instruction lab was difficult. An early initiative in 2005 to create a new learning environment fell short of what the campus needed and prodded the administration to embark on a large-scale assessment.

The 2008 study was conducted by a local architectural firm and assumed no new space for the next ten years. "Assessment methods such as surveys, observations, focus groups, and individual interviews were employed to bring all the stakeholders into the project." The renovations would address the problems noted above by creating more remote storage and repurposing existing areas that had "not met their full potential or for which the purposes [had] changed." Each step was linked but could be considered separate pieces of a master plan.

Among the first projects was redesigning Special Collections. The library surveyed and interviewed researchers to discover what they needed to conduct effective research. The library elevators were renovated in 2012 to improve access. Next, the library modified staff office space and relocated the Digital Projects Lab. While the original five-phase plan from the 2008 study was off track because funding never met the expected levels, the library then selected the next highest priority—to create a digital media commons. A factor in this chose was that a campus task force recommended the library as the best location on campus. Once again, the library surveyed 3717 students to determine their video production needs. The two final projects were to repurpose the reading room to better meet student needs and to enlarge the instruction lab.

Crumpton notes in his conclusion that the library was not able to achieve all the objectives of the admittedly ambitious 2008 goals but stresses that this plan helped provide guidance for the small projects that cumulatively had a greater effect than they would have had if developed independently. I would have liked, however, some discussion of what unfulfilled needs were most important and what might have been done if more funding had become available. I applaud the conscious focus on student learning while not forgetting "making spaces available to support faculty research and instructional needs" and on asking stakeholders what they wanted even if doing so required resolving conflicting needs.

Collaborative Digital Planning for Archives and Special Collections: Blue-Sky Thinking Meets Digital Project Framework. Susan Keen

The Special Collections and University Archives Department (SC) in the Colgate Universities Library used "blue-sky thinking" to create a three to five year plan to identify and plan digitization priorities. (The author's biography furnished the name of the institution.) While SC had completed a small number of digitization projects, the upcoming 150 year anniversary of the university led to increasing requests for university records. Keen "was unable to locate a specific, documented process that suited the department's collaborative culture" so she turned to a methodology she was familiar with called blue-sky thinking that encouraged the uninhibited creation of ideas that would later be evaluated and refined. From another source, she adopted the principles of creativity and flexibility, an excellent decision as the plan would ultimately require revisions soon after its creation. Before beginning the planning process, SC conducted an internal SWOT analysis based on the Claremont Colleges' Digital Projects Model and also completed an external scan of the top two or three groups of internal users.

The actual planning process included five meetings over a two month period. While Keen indicated in her conclusion that a more focused one or two-day meeting would have been preferable, I disagree as the more extended planning period allowed participants to think more deeply about the issues and also to consult outside resources as needed. To briefly summarize, the first meeting created criteria for deciding on projects. In the second, SC staff blue skyed possible projects by listing them on sticky notes. Everyone present identified the photograph collection as the top priority. Six projects received two votes. Finally, the group presented 27 unique projects. The third meeting was a brainstorming session about resources including professors who might collaborate and were the intended audience for the digitized materials. One of Keen's goals was to avoid the elimination of projects due to the lack of resources but to "remain with the positive." At the fourth meeting, staff reported on homework from the first meeting to research assigned topics. The fifth meeting brought it all together. SC decision criteria included the upcoming bicentennial and uncertainty about future developments in many areas. After easily eliminating many projects, the group focused on high-use items, physically fragile and inaccessible rare materials, and resources that had received external requests. The final step was to divide the list into in-house projects, vendor and outsourced projects, and collaborative projects.

The author then submitted a final written report to the university librarian as an internal document without wider distribution, most likely due to concerns about creating expectations that the listed projects would be funded. Keen then enumerates advantages of the report as a base for future planning in Special Collections even though it turned out that "within one year, the plan was outdated." In her words, "the ultimate benefit for Special Collections was that the plan enabled an agile response to change and a quick assessment of the resources that existed to address new priorities."

In my opinion, the following were the most important lessons learned from this excellent planning process. The brainstorming methods made it easier for introverts to participate. The process worked as the group was reasonably small and felt safe in expressing their opinions. Including input from the Library Systems Department would have improved the process. Perhaps, a neutral third party could have directed the discussion rather than the boss "so all can participate freely" though I do not get the impression that the administrator's presence inhibited the positive outcome.

Collaborating for Success. Cecilia Tellis

This is the first case study where I am not sure that the author is describing real events when funding for the Bloomberg database is in danger due to a lack of increase in the library budget and the weak Canadian dollar

that effectively increases the cost of the product. Instead, it has elements of the second definition of "case study" as a teaching tool where students are presented with a problem that they must resolve based on the given circumstances. Partial evidence for this interpretation is a "Questions for Readers" section at the end. Of the five questions, three asked about strategies to increase its use including appealing to users beyond the core group of finance faculty and students. While doing so could indirectly increase pressure for continued funding, I am surprised at a lack of a direct question about additional sources of funding to support the laboratory.

But to return to the case study itself, the institution, once again from the contributor biography, is the University of Ottawa. The head of the business library, Timms, learns from her supervisor that extra funding has been made available for business databases. The supervisor suggests considering acquiring licenses for the Bloomberg terminals needed to provide access to this database. Timms, concerned about what might be a hasty decision, starts to research this resource. She discovers how many other business schools subscribe to Bloomberg and brings in a company representative to demo it to library staff and faculty. Minton, a career counselor, is also very interested in these resources and envisions an entire training laboratory. After a second presentation to the business faculty and verifying that half the business schools in Canada have the product, Timms meets with the dean of the Business School, McDuff, who is responsible for fund-raising activities, and other important University officials. The decision is that this investment "is necessary to stay competitive." The issue is money.

Matters proceed slowly, but Minton speeds up the process by announcing that he is sponsoring a financial competition that depends on having the Bloomberg terminals available. The two terminals get installed. As faculty in other areas become aware of this resource, Timms makes plans for an online booking system that "should help control use and help keep stats on use." The official launch then takes place in the fall as the cumulation of almost five years' efforts. Her boss gives one final lesson to Timms who is concerned that the library was not getting credited for this success: be happy with the success of the project and learn about "leading from behind." The case study then concludes with a reiteration of the funding difficulties faced by the university and questions about what to do next.

Engaging Internal and External Stakeholders in a Comprehensive University Archives Program. Sandra Varry

This case study details the creation of a strategy to collect historical materials related to Florida State University (FSU) that Special Collections and Archives in the library had previously "turned away" and how the solution leads to the establishment of an official unit. To start this complex tale,

"a group of alumni, current and retired faculty, and staff mobilized to solve this problem" in 2001. This unit, the Heritage Protocol (HP), collected materials focused on the student experience and was considered by the library "an 'insurgent' project in direct competition with the University Archives." While the central repository was housed in the main campus library, HP was run jointly by university libraries, the alumni association, and university relations. A second development was the creation of the Heritage Museum in 2011. In 2012, HP was physically moved into Special Collections and "was to be merged with University Archives" although apparently the alumni association and university relations temporarily remained as partners. Overall, the HP collection and the Heritage Museum emphasized the student experience from the 1920s through the 1960s. The author of this case study, Varry, arrived in 2013 to take over this messy organizational structure. An important missing fact is who paid her salary and any other expenses connected with HP. While the case study speaks of resistance to continuing the transfer of the museum space to the library, somehow the unit became the "Heritage Protocol and University Archives (HPUA)" at a date not specified in the case study.

One of the more interesting issues deals with the fact that the museum collection lacked diversity as FSU was a segregated school during the period covered by its archives whose materials were mostly donated by white southerners. Varry comments that "the donation and collection of records often take place decades after their creation" with the implication that it may take time to acquire materials to document the racial, religious, and cultural diversity of FSU.

What follows in the case study is a listing of HPUA's relationships with its many internal, external on campus, and external off-campus stakeholders and an account of its outreach activities. Overall, "success is apparent in the documented increase in museum attendance, reference requests, and the number of tours and events."

The conclusion stresses the importance of the stakeholders even if not all attempts at engagement are successful. Having a small staff means getting pulled in myriad directions and giving up any hope of perfection. Staff should be made to feel that they are working toward a goal instead of "picking away at a never-ending list of seemingly unrelated or low-impact projects."

The Closing of the Library: Using Gilbert's Behavior Engineering Model to Manage Innovative Change. Christina L. Wissinger

This case study deals with the intention to close the J. S. L. Library, focused on the health and biological sciences. Due to high availability of online resources, it would be possible to move "to a fully virtual collection

with library services solely embedded in academic departments." Thus, librarians would be embedded in "the academic departments they serve as opposed to liaisons having offices in the library." On the other hand, the remaining "library staff were required to significantly change their skills" and placed in new positions within the library. The case study states that "the plan to close the library was controversial, on campus and within the library community."

The first very important issue is that the library **did not use** Gilbert's Behavior Engineering Model (BEM) to make this change, but instead the case study illustrates "how BEM could have been used as a framework for reinvention and how other libraries may use BEM as a guide for implementing change." In other words, Dr. Wissinger writes about what might have happened rather than what actually did happen.

The author goes on to describe the BEM model in detail. In brief, BEM separates what an employee brings to the job from environmental elements, focuses on factors employees face in making changes, and is a potential diagnostic tool for finding potential performance problems. A chart presents the model as divided into "Environment" and "Individual" with three categories under each—Information, Resources, and Incentive.

An analysis of the effort to embed librarians in the academic departments shows that the move was closely aligned with BEM principles. The same was not true for library staff. As long-term employees, they were worried about losing their jobs in the transition and felt that they had not been consulted about the decision to close the library and how their jobs would change. The top-down decision to close the library violated the *Motives* section of BEM as staff were not "aware of, and involved in, critical decision–making meetings early in the process." The *Information* part of BEM was also not addressed as new job descriptions were not available to them so that "it was difficult for them to understand what their role would be in the new service model."

The final two pages, however, include a fact hidden up to this point that "the proposal to close the library was abandoned." Changes did occur for liaisons "since the library hired several new liaisons, and all the library liaisons were moved out of the library." For staff, some remained in the library while the others moved off-site to positions with unidentified duties. This ultimate decision to not follow through with the closure undercuts the value of BEM. The "faults" in the process as described in the previous paragraph turned out to be the more effective way to handle the change. The proposed meetings would have turned out, at least in part, to be a waste of time. Perhaps, the administration made the correct decision in choosing to defer discussing the closure and new job duties with staff because administrators suspected that library might remain open. Overall, I consider this to be the weakest case study in the volume for its lack of transparency.

ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF CASE STUDIES

The principal advantage of using case studies of this type is that they recount real-world, practical experiences instead of being a theoretical discussion of the issues. The authors produce examples of the effect of management decisions. A good case study should also transcend the problem at hand to provide evidence of general principles that lead to management success. Examples in this volume include the benefits of systematic planning, flexibility in changing objectives to match available resources, and the positive results from involving all staff including non-librarians in decision-making.

The first major disadvantage of the case study method is evaluating the accuracy of the information presented. The author of any case study has reasons to present positive outcomes and to minimize negative ones. Case studies about failures would provide valuable management information by pointing out mistakes and then discussing how to avoid them, but such case studies seldom get written. Instead, how-we-did-it-good is a recognized way to describe library projects. In addition, the principle of cognitive dissonance explains why the writer might present the facts in the best possible light even with no intention to deceive as humans have the natural tendency to prefer describing their successes rather than their failures. A second problem is that the author of the case study may not be aware of or interpret correctly the thoughts or actions of others. In one case study, I seriously questioned whether the staff were as positive about the manager's changes as she thought they were. Furthermore, the author may not be privy to the reasons why higher administrators made the decisions that they did. Perhaps, the provost funded the library project because she did not like the person who presented the competing idea rather than she judged the library proposal to be the best use of funds. Faculty may like the library, not because of its excellence but because they do not have experience with any other academic library.

A second disadvantage is whether the lessons from the case study are applicable to the reader's library. A case study has the same faults as anecdotal evidence by having little statistical validity as it presents only one isolated occurrence. One of the persistent criticisms of management literature is that the success of an organization does not guarantee that the same strategies will work elsewhere. Many case studies in this volume are clearly rooted in the local practice and culture of the library and of the college/university. What works in a large research library may be inapplicable to a liberal arts or community college library and vice-versa. I am not sure how many readers would read this volume from cover to cover. Instead, I suspect that librarians will focus on those case studies dealing with their professional interests and their type of library.

My final observation is that these case studies would be less valuable to me in teaching a management class than the second type that presents a problem to be solved by the students. While I could assign the task of having students evaluate the case studies in this volume, the learning experience would not be as rich as having students discover on their own a possible solution to an intentionally difficult management problem.