Macquarie University ResearchOnline

This is the author's version of an article from the following conference:

Brodie, Maxine & Graham, Meredith (2010). Building new foundations for Macquarie University's new Library : why the people count more than the concrete. *Academic librarian 2 : singing in the rain : ALSR 2010 : conference towards future possibilities*, March 11-12, 2010, Hong Kong.

Access to the published version:

Building new foundations for Macquarie University's new Library – why the people count more than the concrete

Maxine Brodie, University Librarian, Macquarie University, maxine.brodie@mq.edu.au

Meredith Graham, Program Manager, New Library 2010/2011, Macquarie University, meredith.graham@mq.edu.au

ABSTRACT

This case study continues the documentation of the long-term, transformational change strategies begun at Macquarie University Library in 2006 and presented to the last ASLR Conference in 2007. During 2005/06 we improved the design of jobs and structure to build a more flexible Library. These changes were implemented during 2006/07, supported by extensive training and new approaches to planning, team building, performance monitoring and governance.

This paper examines the outcomes of the 2006/07 strategy and the lessons learned. Then it describes how we are leveraging the building of a completely new University Library to build a new library culture, service philosophy and organisational structure based on an agreed set of values. We will describe the planning, staff and client engagement strategies we have been using in our Strategic Planning and Library 2010 Service Innovation Programs to facilitate these outcomes. In the words of your theme song for *ASLR2010 – "What a glorious feelin' – we're restructuring again!"* – but this time in the context of a whole new beginning for Macquarie University and its Library.

INTRODUCTION

In 2007 we documented the first stage of Macquarie University Library's journey towards transformational change which would support the achievement of the strategic aims of the University and the Library (Brodie and Martinelli, 2007). This paper reflects on the achievements and lessons learned during this first stage. It then explores the second stage of our journey, which will take us to the completion of the new physical Library building at the end of 2010 and the commissioning of new services for first semester 2011. In our first paper we talked about where to start on a journey of this kind: "In our view there is only one place to start and one place to finish and that is with people – our clients and our staff" (Brodie and Martinelli, 2007, p.558). Despite the excitement and challenge of constructing a completely new physical Library, this paper will show that we believe these two aspects are still the most important to guide and inform our journey – and that is why the people count more than the concrete!

BACKGROUND

Strategic Context

The overall strategic context for *Library Restructure 2004-2006* was contained in *Library Strategic Plan 2005-2006*. This *Plan* identified the context of a rapidly changing environment and, in particular, three changing roles for academic libraries which were based on technological developments:

- the move to the hybrid library - a blend of physical and electronic resources
- changing patterns of publishing, with an emphasis on electronic publishing
- meeting the needs of a new generation of clients who expect to be able to access information electronically, on a 24/7 basis.

At the beginning of 2006 the University set a new strategic direction with *Macquarie@50* *(*available at *http://www.vc.mq.edu.au/report-to-council/macquarie-at-50.pdf), aiming to be in the top 8 universities in Australia and the top 200 in the world by 2014. The second phase of Library Restructure 2004-2006 took into account the focus areas of the *Library Strategic Plan 2007-09,* which were developed in response to MQ@50:

- a focus on research and strong links between research and teaching
- the development of new physical and technical infrastructure
- a renewed focus on organisational sustainability and ethical practice.

Major Strategic Outcomes

At the end of 2009 the University and the Library had achieved some significant strategic outcomes:

- the University is now ranked 9th in Australia (15th in 2006) and 268th in the world (286th in 2006), as measured by the *Shanghai Jiao Tong Academic Ranking of World Universities*.
- the Library's governance committee, the Library Committee, has been reconstituted as part of the Academic Senate Review and the Library has also implemented a Quality Review Group to implement the University's Quality Enhancement Framework. Over the last three years the Library has continued to strengthen its customer focus as a result of regular client surveys, client and staff suggestions and formal service reviews. The Library implements and reports back to clients on an average of 20 service improvements each year. One example of a significant service improvement is the growth in self-service loans over the period, – from 30% of total loans in 2006 to 79% in 2009 (including Reserve loans) – which eliminates the need for clients to queue at a service desk. This is part of our philosophy of building client self sufficiency.
- electronic resources and services are rated in our client surveys as highly important to our clients because they support flexibility in study and research. The success of this strategy is reflected in our holdings and our usage statistics. We held 77,000 electronic journals at the end of 2009 (32,000 in 2006); we held 135,500 eBooks at the end of 2009 (22,500 in 2006). Expenditure on eResources is now 75% of the annual acquisition budget (64% in 2006). At the end of 2006 we recorded 5,564 physical visits to the Library per calendar day and 5,460 web visits. By December 2009 these figures were 5,562 physical visits (despite the relocation of a 100-seat computer laboratory to another building) and 9,688 web visits per calendar day.
- several core improvements to our technical infrastructure and software platforms have led to service improvements for clients. During this three year period we refreshed the entire Library PC fleet (client and staff); implemented a scalable, cost-effective and reliable server environment; implemented *Macquarie University ResearchOnline* to support the University's open access mandate and to improve the exposure of the University's research outputs; worked with University IT to improve the wireless network in the Library and to secure the major Library servers in the University data centre and disaster recovery environment; and launched a new website based on extensive client input to improve navigation and interfaces to core resources, such as the Library catalogue.
- the construction of the $92m new Library has reached a significant milestone with the completion of the concrete structure and the handover of the vault space for the construction of the Automated Storage and Retrieval System. The focus of the design is on provision of effective informal learning environments in a building which incorporates sustainable practices. Further information on the design of the new Library is available in Brodie (2008) and on the new Library website http://www.lib.mq.edu.au/newlibrary/
- the implementation of a restructure to create a more flexible organisation was completed within the existing budget during 2007.

FIRST STAGE: EVALUATION OF THE 2006/2007 RESTRUCTURE

Desired Outcomes
Our desired outcomes for the 2006/07 Restructure were to:
- meet our guiding principles to become more agile, resilient, informed, connected, successful and responsible as an organisation (Brodie and Martinelli, 2007, p560).
- create the climate for us to work on simplifying services for clients and encouraging them to become self-sufficient in finding, using and evaluating information.
- create promotional opportunities for staff across the Library
- "future-proof" jobs using a multi-skilling approach
- retain the skills and knowledge of existing staff
- incorporate best practice standards such as the IT Service Management Framework to complement our existing total quality service approach
- improve connections between Library staff, within the University community and within the Library community.

Outcomes Achieved
Our plan was to develop and implement a new organisational structure based on our six guiding principles. This structure has been fully implemented within the existing budget and consists of six Departments and a Project Office, grouped according to whether the primary focus is on delivering services or on providing capability:

The **Library Services Group** comprises those functions that are our "core business", making us a library rather than any other kind of organisation – *Information Access* (find, evaluate and use information); *Resource Access* (get access to documents in all formats); and Information Resources (manage the life cycle of documents in all formats). This Group reports to the University Librarian.

The **Library Capabilities Group** provides essential support for our core business operations and would be found in some form in organisations of any size. Without these capabilities the Library cannot function – *Library IT* (client support, infrastructure and application support); *Library Development* (staff and organisational development, communications and marketing, community engagement); *Library Business Services* (facilities, compliance, financial and risk management). In our environment these functions also provide some direct client services in their own right, e.g. IT Training and access to photocopying and other equipment. The *Library Project Office* also forms a part of this group, providing us with a focus and process for turning ideas into action. This Group reports to the Deputy University Librarian.

The application of the guiding principles to the achievement of our desired outcomes can be demonstrated as follows:
- our strategic outcomes show we have become more *agile* through the streamlining of many procedures, the use of the Project Office structure, project management training and creation of a permanent Service Innovation Program. In 2007 we also introduced the Eoin H. Wilkinson Service Innovation Grant, in memory of the second Macquarie University Librarian. The Grant was offered and awarded on a competitive basis in 2007 and 2008 to encourage staff to submit ideas for service innovation. In 2009 this Award was subsumed into ideas exploration for the new Library. Early in 2008 the new Library 2010 Program was established as the Library's major Service Innovation Program for 2008/09
- we have become more *resilient* through: the creation of multi-level, multi-team structures with manageable spans; the pairing of Liaison Librarians for each discipline to ensure continuity of client service; and the focus on multi-skilling in Resources Access and Information Resources. 75% of staff who were in Resource

Access at the time of the Restructure have been given multi-skilling opportunities and the same has been true for 66% of staff in Information Resources

- we have become better *informed* through the establishment of a Quality Review Group comprising all of the team-leader level roles created during the Restructure. These roles all have a responsibility for service evaluation and improvement – for "thinking as well as doing". This approach to decision-making has also been strengthened by the creation of a full-time Quality and Planning Coordinator role and the use of an evidence based approach in the new Library Service Innovation Program
- we have become more *connected* to our clients and the wider community in a number of ways: creation of the Communication and Community & Industry Partnerships teams in Library Development; provision of opportunities for direct, external client contact in service delivery and Committee membership; and the ongoing review of overall Library governance as part of the implementation process. There is also growing evidence of the involvement of Library staff in a wide range of University Committees and Working Parties
- we have been *successful* in achieving our strategic aims over the last three years and in meeting the desired outcomes of the Restructure. Our staff retention rates from 2006 to 2009 have been high. During the Restructure there was only one voluntary redundancy. Between 2006 and the end of 2009 only 2 permanent staff have retired and 13 permanent staff have resigned (turnover rate of around 3-4% per annum). At the same time we created promotional and staff refresh opportunities. 42% of the staff in place during the first two phases of the Restructure achieved a promotion or confirmation in a higher position. 31 new staff were hired in the third phase of the Restructure. Some of our entry level positions have been redesigned to attract those studying information science, IT and related disciplines. Our annual investment in staff development has been more than 1.5% of our annual salaries budget. In 2007 the Library acted as a pilot site for the University's implementation of the new Performance Development and Review process. The PD&R process is now used to develop the annual training and development program for all staff. In 2008 the University also implemented a Rewards and Recognition Policy. The first Library awards were made in 2008
- we have been *responsible* by: achieving the Restructure within the existing budget and by creating a focus on risk management and compliance in Library Business Services and inclusion of these issues as areas of accountability in job descriptions. The design of our new Library incorporates sustainable practices and the Library's commitment to sustainability was recently highlighted by our achievement of second place in the first University Sustainability Challenge held in 2009.

Staff Perceptions

The section above provides some tangible evidence of outcomes for clients and staff. What about the "intangibles" – the underlying perceptions and experiences of staff? Over the past three years we have created or participated in opportunities to gauge the perceptions of our staff in relation to the impact of our strategy and the Restructure. In 2006 and 2008 Library staff took part in the University's "Your Say" survey developed and run an independent team of researchers from the Voice Project. The whole of University results for 2008 compared to 2006 are available at http://www.mq.edu.au/quality/docs/your_say_2008.pdf. In addition to the high-level report each area of the University was given more detailed confidential feedback on how their area had rated items as compared to the University average. This information indicated that Library staff were more likely than the rest of the University to:

- positively view the University and its aims and its senior leadership
- understand the purpose, vision and strategy of the University
- believe that change is handled well
- believe the University is successful

- have the resources required to do the job
- expect high standards of performance and encourage continuous improvement
- believe that development has led to improved work performance and that career opportunities are available
- have a strong psychological contract with the University, with high levels of loyalty and pride.

At a Library level only we also ran a confidential *Library Employee Opinion Survey Report* in March 2008, which was conducted as a benchmarked survey provided by Insync Surveys (www.insyncsurveys.com.au). There was a 74% response rate to this survey of staff perceptions about the importance of a range of organisational dimensions and our perceived performance on these dimensions. These results confirmed and complemented some of the *Your Say Survey* results, but also raised some issues for further consideration. The three dimensions most important to staff were: Customer/Market Focus, People and Strategy & Planning Processes. The three dimensions on which staff thought the Library *performed* the best were Strategy & Planning Processes, Leadership & Innovation and Business Results. The top 10 high performance variables were related to planning/goal setting, communication, leadership, work/life balance, providing a safe working environment, understanding where work fits within the Library and change management. These are similar to the *Your Say Survey* results. Four of these variables were also in the top 10 for high importance to staff - providing a safe working environment, two way communication with the immediate supervisor, having the immediate supervisor listen and respond and balancing work and life demands. The three areas where staff perceived the "gap" between importance and performance to be greatest were: valuing staff, cooperation across work areas and understanding of library user needs by staff. This last variable also relates to the lowest scoring dimension on the survey – using Data, Information and Knowledge.

Client Perceptions
We have already discussed some of the tangible outcomes of our strategy for clients, particularly the improvements in electronic resources and services. In our 2004, 2006 and 2008 Client Surveys (also provided by Insync Surveys as a benchmark survey for Australasian university libraries) our clients continued to rate the existing physical Library as a space that failed to meet their needs – and these issues will be addressed through the construction of the new Library. However, over the same period the ratings given by clients on the performance of our staff improved. Clients perceived higher levels of performance on fairness, professionalism, friendliness and helpfulness, attentiveness to and understanding of client needs, clear and accurate responses, quality service, availability to assist and timely service.

Lessons Learned
Overall then it appears that Restructure 2006/07 was a positive part of the achievement of our strategic goals for 2007-2009. To extend the assessment provided above we are now in the process of gathering feedback from individual members of staff on their perceptions of the impacts of the last Restructure on themselves, their team, their Department and the Library as a whole. This feedback will also help us to learn from the last experience. So what are some of the lessons we have already learned? What would we do again? What would we do differently?

The first constant is the importance of having a clear strategic context for any organisational changes, accompanied by a clear set of guiding principles and ways to measure the success or failure of the changes. We are carrying this forward to the second stage of our journey as we develop *Library Strategic Plan 2010-2012* in the context of the University's family of plans, including *Strategic Directions 2008-2012: Partnership and Performance* (available at http://www.mq.edu.au/quality/policy_planning/strategic_directions_2008_2012.pdf), the new

Academic Plan 2010-2014 and the University's aspirations for organisational sustainability, institutional performance and for community and business engagement.

While our staff and clients appear to have a good understanding of our direction, we are also extending this planning process in the second stage of our journey to include the building of a set of shared, lived values and a shared service philosophy. In 2008 the University articulated the six core values which guide our behaviour towards students, staff and the community: ethical, enquiring, creative, inclusive, agile and excellent. Most of these values have some resonance with our six guiding principles from Restructure 2006. We currently engaged in a process (facilitated by Anecdote Pty Ltd, www.anecdote.com.au) to understand what these values really mean to Library staff for the delivery of our services and to see how we might incorporate these as "lived" values for the future, rather than just words on a page.

The second constant is the need to take a client-centric rather than a library-centric view of our services and how these are delivered. Some key themes that have emerged from the development of our service philosophy for the new Library are: the need to take a holistic approach to clients and their needs and the concept of "learning together" in a partnership approach to design and delivery of services. Central to improved client involvement and consultation is the "lead and listen" approach. Our clients (and staff) expect us to provide ideas and alternatives – they need to be able to have input to tailor the shape of our services. We have also learned that our clients are very busy people and we need to find different approaches to gain their input. Tight timelines can also make meaningful client consultation quite difficult to achieve. The other continuous thread for client service is the importance of developing client self-sufficiency in finding, using and evaluating information to support the development of critical thinking and analytical skills in our graduates – this also includes the continued need to simplify our services and to increase our self-service offerings.

The third constant, paradoxically, is change itself. This means that strategy and organisational design need to evolve in the context of changing needs and expectations. Galbraith (2001) talks about the need for companies to design organisations "from the outset to be more easily changeable" (Galbraith, 2001, p1) and about what this means for strategy, structure, processes, people and reward systems. We will explore these ideas on the second stage of our journey and the implications they have for evolutionary and/or revolutionary organisational change.

The fourth constant is the need to consolidate and support change – not so easy in a rapidly changing environment. The implementation of new structures and staff in Restructure 2006/07 was barely complete by the time we moved into the mammoth task of planning the new Library. An example of this is the "two-edged" sword of our multi-skilling strategy. While there has been significant success in the implementation of this strategy (as documented above), it has required a large investment of time for training from our Teamleaders and we have not had time to review, consolidate and fine-tune the outcomes. The creation of the "thinking and doing" Teamleader level across the Library has brought about many improvements to services and communication – but we are conscious that this group has also not had the full level of support required to facilitate their move to these new roles and responsibilities.

This leads us to a consideration of what we might do differently in this second stage – what changes will we make based on lessons learned?

The first change we will make is to shorten the time we take to develop and implement any organisational changes arising from our 2010-2012 strategy. Restructure 2006/07 took almost three years because we failed Kotter's first test of successful transformational change: "establish a sense of urgency" (Kotter, 1995, p.60). The timeline for moving to our

new physical Library at the end of 2010 now creates exactly that sense of urgency. Linked to this is a real sense of opportunity – the new Library is more than just a change in location – it is an opportunity to rethink everything we do.

The second change is to make our planning for organisational change more inclusive and holistic. Last time we developed the proposals for change at a Library Department level - this time our new service philosophy dictates that we need to take an integrated approach from a client perspective, to develop a single Library-wide proposal for change and to include all staff who wish to engage in developing and fine-tuning the changes. The move to the new Library is an important decision point for staff, so we will be providing them with options should they decide that they do not want to embrace the changes that we might make.

The third change is to build, where possible, a greater sense of "connectedness" across the organisational structure and with our clients. While the feedback indicates that Restructure 2006/07 established much clearer reporting lines and role clarity, our six new Library Departments were based on function. We now need to develop ways to better connect the different parts of the structure and to grow agility using more than just the Project Office. This includes examination of career paths from entry level up, encouragement of the sharing of information among staff, and more "joined-up" groups of staff and of services. This sense of "connectedness" is one of the ingredients of a reconfigurable organisation (Galbraith, 2001) but it also requires some improved organisational capabilities in communication and the management of conflict. In response to the issues we have faced with effective client communication we are also exploring the creation of Client Reference Groups to provide us with much more immediate and detailed client feedback.

The fourth change is to recognise the impact of the changes and the need for time to refine and consolidate any changes, particularly in the context of the move to the new Library in 2010/2011. This relates also to our current sense that we are trying to "sprint a marathon" - as evolutionary change in our organisation becomes "business as usual" we also need to create space for reflection, evaluation and fine-tuning.

SECOND STAGE: NEW LIBRARY 2010/2011

So how have we begun to put some of these lessons into practice?

New Library 2010: Service Innovation Program 2008-2009

Using the organisational structures established in the first stage we set up our planning for the new Library as our Service Innovation Program for 2008/09, working closely with the University's Building Project Committees. This Program had five major related Project Teams tasked with achieving deliverables within specified timeframes. The five major projects were: Service Delivery; Collection Access; IT; Building Management; Communication and Fundraising. We used Critical Path Analysis for all of these Projects to make sure we focused our efforts on the tasks that needed to be completed prior to our move to the new Library. Each Project Team identified tasks which needed investigation and set up Working Parties to complete the required tasks and/or develop proposals to be used for consultation with Library staff, clients and other stakeholders as appropriate. The overarching purpose of this Program was to create awareness of the issues and opportunities involved in the new Library and to engage as many staff and clients as we could in rethinking our services and learning environments. The Project Teams were also encouraged to take an evidence-based approach to as much of their work as possible – "utilizing the best available evidence in conjunction with a pragmatic perspective developed from working experiences" (Eldredge, 2002, p. 72). Some examples of work completed by the Project Teams using this approach are:

The *Collection Access Project Team* developed our agreed Collection Storage Principles for our browseable and stored items; has completed 75% of the colour coding (and barcoding where necessary) of items in preparation for the move; and begun the task of consulting with each academic discipline about the planned location of items.

The *Service Delivery Project Team* has developed our new service philosophy and potential service catalogue and models of delivery for the new Library. We are now working on developing these service models by looking at what services we will offer, how we will deliver these and who will deliver them. We have also developed the design for spaces for clients with special needs in consultation with Welfare and Equity Services.

The *Building Management Project Team* has coordinated the work of the Automated Storage and Retrieval System (ASRS) Implementation Group so that we can identify and manage all of the logistics, IT and OHS issues involved. This team is also responsible for sustainability initiatives and for the relocation of heritage items and special features from the old Library, such as the Lachlan Macquarie Room and our stained glass windows. They have also planned the logistics for the move in consultation with potential removal companies.

The *IT Project Team* has assessed the IT needs of staff and clients in both the physical and virtual learning spaces of the new Library. They have prepared strategic and operational approaches to a range of service, collection access and building management issues and have communicated these to University IT and the Design Group for the Project.

The *Communications and Fund Raising Project Team* developed and has maintained the Library 2010 web and intranet sites and a series of communications, consultation and issues management toolkits. Work is also complete on development of a brief for wayfinding in the new Library. This team has also planned a number of highly successful celebrations for such milestones as the turning of the first sod on site and the pouring of the first concrete slab. This team has also worked with the University's Office of Institutional Advancement to develop and explore fund-raising and sponsorship opportunities for the new Library.

By the end of 2009 the Project Teams had initiated 51 Working Parties on different issues. 119 different members of staff have now participated in a Working Party or Project Team. This is about 83% of permanent staff and the real participation figure is much higher when support tasks are included. Clients have also been involved in a range of consultations about a variety of issues. During 2009 four tasks on the critical path were flagged as having fallen behind schedule – and work was done to bring these back on schedule by the Library 2010 Program Steering Committee.

These are the tangible outcomes we have achieved from a Program designed to raise awareness and foster engagement with issues involved in planning our new service and learning environments. What about staff perceptions, including their feelings about the changes to come?

At the beginning of Restructure 2006/07 we had no baseline data for these staff perceptions. This time we have had the opportunity to engage in a long-term longitudinal study of adaptation to change across a number of organisations being conducted by Macquarie's Department of Psychology. The first survey of staff was conducted in late September 2009 – towards the end of the New Library 2008/09 projects but before the development of any proposals for organisational change (Griffin et al, 2009). This survey will be run again as we get closer to the move to the new Library and then again afterwards to gauge any difference in staff readiness for and reaction to the changes.

More than 80% of the permanent staff responded to this survey, with good representation at all levels and from all Departments. 72.5% of respondents were positively in favour of

changes being necessary to improve the Library's operations and 79% of respondents agreed that management actively supports job changes and employee development. 84% of respondents said they were accessing information about new Library work at least sometimes. 40% of respondents were involved with new Library work more than 5 hours per week; 40% for 5 hours or less and the remaining 20% said they were not involved at all. 94% of respondents felt moderately confident that they could cope with changes – and 55% said they were proactive about suggesting or making change. Only 30% felt moderately resistant to changes – senior staff and younger staff were less likely to be change-resistant. An interesting relationship emerged – respondents who said they had *more access to information* regarded the changes required to be more challenging but respondents who had more *involvement* with the change projects believed the changes to be challenging but not threatening or stressful. This supports the view that "fear of change" is in part "fear of the unknown" (Senge, 2000, p. 5) and that this level of fear can be reduced through awareness raising and involvement in the process.

So how successful do staff perceive the Project Team and Working Party approach to have been? 60% of the respondents thought the Program Steering Committee was managing the projects well and that clear messages were provided about what was going on. However, only 50% felt the Working Parties had functioned effectively and involved staff in the decision-making process and only the same percentage felt that the Intranet site for the Program provided effective communication. This same view on the effectiveness of Working Parties surfaced in the "stories" that were collected in the project we are running to examine what the University's core values mean to Library staff. The pervasive view was that there was so much happening across the Project Teams that it was difficult for staff to have any clear view of what had been explored and what had been recommended or decided – and in some cases which issues were part of Library 2010 and which were not. This is being addressed in part through the creation of a "map" of issues and outcomes that will be used to summarise the substantial progress that has been made in the New Library 2010: 2008/09 Service Innovation Program. However, we are aware that we will still be living with complexity for some time.

One insight that we gained through our work on exploring our values (described in the next section) was to be able to see the reactions of staff as a natural consequence of the nature of the complexity of changes we are contemplating. Snowden and Boone (2007) describe four types of operating contexts:

> *Simple* – where cause and effect are clear and there is a single correct answer – these are the "known knowns" in the domain of best (past) practice
> *Complicated* – where effort (usually analysis) is needed to see the relationship between cause and effect – these are the "known unknowns"
> *Complex* – where cause and effect relationships are intertwined and outcomes only make sense with hindsight – these are the "unknown unknowns" requiring patient exploration
> *Chaotic* - where the patterns and relationships are indiscernible and the only choice is to act in the hope that this will lead to new patterns that will lead to a solution – these are the "unknowables".

Much or our early work on New Library 2010 Projects was in the complicated and/or complex operating domains. As many staff prefer to operate in the simple domain, some of the staff reactions to our work so far are not surprising. This is why the "lead and listen" approach has become even more relevant for the next phase of our work. We are also aware that it is difficult to maintain a sense of urgency across a long period of time. To help address some of these problems we are reframing the next phase of the Program over the next two years.

<u>New Library 2010: Service Innovation Program 2010/2011</u>
In recognition of the need to allow a period for moving in to the new Library and fine-tuning our changes we are extending the timeframe for this next phase to 2010/2011. The revamped program will have two strands only to help reduce complexity and provide focus:

Strand 1: Organisational Change
Tasks in this strand will focus on the human aspects of the change process and activities related to organisational design. This includes strategic planning and values, finalisation of our service catalogue and proposed service model, organisational structure, job design, governance and appropriate consultation. Key deliverables will be the Library 2010-2012 Strategic Plan, the Managing Change Proposal and Implementation Plan.

Strand 2: Logistics
Tasks in this strand will focus on the practical aspects of moving from the old Library to the new Library and will encompass much of the work of the existing Collection Access, IT and Building Management Teams, plus logistics tasks arising from Strand 1 and related client communications.

The Program will be managed using the existing decision-making and communication structures of the Library – the Library Management Team and the Teamleaders Group from across all Departments. To reduce confusion and to help recreate the sense of urgency our action plan for 2010 will be related either to maintaining core services or to delivering on a task related to organisational change or logistics for the new Library. Instead of establishing Working Parties with several members to undertake tasks we will nominate "task pairs" or an individual to work on a discrete task in one of the strands – so that a first pass of a proposal or recommendation can then be made available much more rapidly for comment by staff and/or clients. This approach should assist with improved "connectedness" across issues and teams.

<u>Values Project</u>
One of the enduring lessons we described above was the need to have a strategy and a set of guiding principles for any organisational change. In mid 2009 we engaged consultants Anecdote Pty Ltd to help us to achieve a number of objectives related to the development of our new strategic plan and the development of a new service philosophy. The core objectives were to:

- 'unpack' the meaning of the University values and how they impact the Library, the Library staff and the Library's clients. (As indicated above the University had launched its new 'One voice, one image' branding with a set of values in 2008).
- engage Library staff in understanding what the values mean to them and their role in the Library, and how they can "live" these values on a daily basis.
- engage all Library staff in developing a service philosophy that has real meaning for staff, that is owned by staff and that provides guidance for daily and strategic actions and practices.
- help Library staff to understand how intrinsic the Library's service philosophy and Values are to all roles in the Library and how they can guide behaviours and change outcomes for staff and students.
- have fun and generate a creative approach to learning and engagement in building a workplace of excellence.

While the Library had a set of stated Values in *Library Strategic Plan 2007-09* these have had limited impact on our service delivery, and they are not well known or embedded in work practice or behaviours. At the time of writing we have completed the awareness raising and exploration phases of the values project. We are in the process of:

- finalising our description for each of the six University values from a Library perspective and the relationship of "ethical" in particular to the core values of the Australian information profession (http://www.alia.org.au/policies/core.values.html)
- developing the "personas" or "archetypes" in our experience that can be used to help illustrate the behaviours we want to see more or less of in the workplace
- identifying actions we can take to bring the values to life for staff and to "live the values" on an ongoing basis
- incorporating "storytelling" as a powerful means of describing values, strategy and service philosophy.

Why is this work so important for the new Library? Town (2006) discusses the importance of value and impact measurement for libraries and the link that can be drawn between university values and the academic library's value proposition – a concept that has been explored in the SCONUL Value and Impact Measurement Programme (VAMP). Brophy (2004) suggests that "narrative-based librarianship" can be a powerful addition to evidence-based approaches to assist in sensemaking and communication with both library staff and clients, particularly in complex situations.

We also know from our first staff change survey (Griffin et al., 2009) that only 47% of respondents felt strongly that their individual values and the Library's values were currently a good fit. Less than 10% felt strongly that their values were not a good fit with the Library and the remaining 43% were ambivalent. So at least we have the opportunity to improve the fit for a very large part of the Library. But isn't a good strategy enough? After all, surveys of Library staff show that the majority think the strategy is clear and in the Griffin survey 78% of respondents reported being clear about their performance requirements and goals, 79% were also clear about how to get their job done and 72.5% supported the need for changes to the Library's operations. This is more than the 75% that Kotter suggests is necessary among managers to create a sense of urgency (Kotter, 1995, p.62).

While this might look like a strong starting point for change the management literature shows that managers ignore the reasons for any resistance to change at their peril. Schein puts it this way: "the bottom line for leaders is that if they do not become conscious of the cultures in which they are embedded, those cultures will manage them" (Schein, 2004, p.23). Schein talks about the culture of an organisation as having three levels:

> *Artifacts* – the organisation's visual structures and processes
> *Espoused values* – the organisation's "justifications" - strategies, goals, philosophies
> *Basic underlying assumptions* – these are the unconscious, taken for granted beliefs, perceptions, thoughts and feelings, which are the ultimate source of values and actions. (Schein, 2004, p.25)

This is why we are investing time and resources into our current projects. In our view the success of our new Library will depend on how well we can work at all three levels of our culture in this second stage of our journey – not just at the visible levels. And this is also why it's always the people (and their stories) that count more than the concrete of our new Library.

<u>CONCLUSION</u>
For centuries the telling of stories has been an integral part of different cultures around the world. Mark Bahti (1988) evokes the Pueblo tradition of story-telling as follows:

> *"During the long winter nights when the earth, plants, animals and people were quiet and resting, awaiting the sun's return, story telling was a regular,*

even nightly event. The story took the listeners on a journey that would bring renewal of life" (Bahti, 1988, p. 10)

Once these stories have been written down they have also been made accessible to future generations through libraries. So we think it is highly appropriate that we are learning to tell our own story, so that we can bring our values and our strategy to life on this second stage of our journey towards the renewal of the Library and its services. We concluded our last paper by quoting the poet Constantine Cafavy (1911), whose exhortation is as relevant to the second stage of our journey as it was to the first:

"When you set out on your journey to Ithaca
pray that the road is long,
full of adventure, full of knowledge…"

REFERENCES

Bahti, M. (1988) *Pueblo stories and storytellers* Tucson, Arizona, Treasure Chest Publications.

Brodie, M. and Martinelli, M. (2007), "Creating a new Library for Macquarie University: are we there yet?" *Library Management*, Vol. 28, Issue 8/9, pp.557-568.

Brodie, M. (2008), "Watch this space: designing a new Library for Macquarie University" paper presented at VALA 2008 14th Biennial Conference and Exhibition: Libraries: changing places, virtual spaces, 5-7 February, 2008, Melbourne, Australia. Available at: http://www.valaconf.org.au/vala2008/papers2008/61_Brodie_Final.pdf (accessed 31 January 2010).

Brophy, P. (2004) "Narrative-based librarianship" Available at: http://www.cerlim.ac.uk/projects/nbl_brophy.pdf (accessed 31 January 2010)

Cavafy, C.P. (1911), "Ithaca" Available at : http://www.igreens.org.uk/ithaca.htm (accessed 31 January 2010).

Eldredge, J.D. (2002) "Evidence-based librarianship" what might we expect in the years ahead?" *Health Information Libraries Journal*, Vol. 19, no.2, pp.71-77.

Galbraith, J. (2001) "Designing a reconfigurable organization" Working Paper available at http://www.jaygalbraith.com/pdfs/reconfigurableorg.pdf (accessed 31 January 2010) Version also published as Chapter 6 in Galbraith, J. (2001) *Designing organizations: an executive guide to strategy, structure and process.* 2nd ed., New York, Wiley.

Griffin, B., Searle, B., Niessen, C and Braun, I (2009) *Adaptation to changing working environments: Summary of Time 1 Survey (before change).* Unpublished report, Macquarie University, Sydney.

Kotter, J.P. (1995) "Leading change: why transformation efforts fail", *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 73, Issue 2, pp.59-67.

Schein, E.H. (2004) *Organizational culture and leadership.* 3rd ed. San Francisco, Jossey Bass.

Senge, P. Kaeufer, K. (2000) "Creating change" *Executive Excellence*, Vol. 17, Issue 10, pp.4-5.

Snowden, D.J. and Boone, M.E. (2007) "A leader's framework to decision making" *Harvard Business Review,* Vol. 85, Issue 11, pp.68-76.

Town, S. (2006) "The SCONUL Value and Impact Measurement Programme (VAMP): a progress report". *SCONUL Focus,* No. 38, Summer/Autumn, pp.114-116.