

# LIBRARY SELF-STUDIES: THE INDIANA EXPERIENCE

*Larry Hardesty*

## INTRODUCTION

A higher percentage of Indiana academic libraries have participated in various self-study programs conducted by the Office of Management Studies of the Association of Research Libraries than academic libraries in any other state in the nation. This shows the interest that academic librarians of Indiana have in planning, and the generosity of the Lilly Endowment in supporting many of these self-studies.

When planning the program for Fall 1981 ILA conference, the College and Universities Libraries Division, those of us on the program committee felt that a number of college and university librarians would be interested in learning more about the self-study experiences in the Hoosier State. We tried to gather a number of distinguished panelists who had a wide variety of experiences with the OMS self-studies in order to enlighten Indiana librarians about the planning process. The papers which follow are spinoffs from the ILA program.

Grady Morein provided us with an overview of the self-study process and an insight into the underlying philosophy.

Nyal Williams served as chairman of the self-study team at Ball State; from this he shared the perspective of a management review and analysis (MRAP) self-study in midstream at a medium-sized university.

Rowan Daggett served on the self-study team at Manchester College and spoke from the point of view of an administrator rather than a librarian viewing the immediate results of a self-study at a small liberal arts college.

Betty Jo Irvine represented the perspective of one who had more time to reflect on the results of a self-study.

Both the panelists and those of us who served on the College and Universities Division Planning Committee have been pleased by the response to their papers. We are grateful to INDIANA LIBRARIES for making it possible for the papers to reach a wider audience.

*Editor's Note:* Due to lack of space Dr. Daggett's remarks have not been included.

## THE INDIANA EXPERIENCE WITH SELF-STUDIES

*Dr. Grady Morein*

Self-study is essentially a type of planning and, to me as a practitioner and student of Library Management, planning has become and will continue to be the most significant element of management. Planning has moved to the forefront of management and will remain there for several reasons, most of them readily apparent to each of you. The primary reason planning has become so important is that our world has become so incredibly complex that conditions and situations can suddenly change rapidly.

The one exception that I would take regarding Alvin Toffler's magnificent book *FUTURE SHOCK*<sup>1</sup> is with the title. To me the book clearly demonstrates that the shock is not in the future, but is here now. A more appropriate title, then, would have been *PRESENT SHOCK*.

All of us are acutely aware of the tremendous rate at which change is occurring. Rapid change is a fact of life. But in many respects, change has gotten away from us and has seemingly gotten out of control. In actuality, there are many occasions in which change is out of control and needs to be brought back into control. This is where planning comes into the picture. Change can be brought into control only through planning.

There are some who would ignore or resist change. Without recognizing change, the professional loses control. Control exists only when definite actions are designed and implemented to bring about desirable change.

We can, for example, ignore and/or resist the energy crisis and the depletion of certain natural resources, but this will not allow us to control it. We can ignore the spiraling book and periodical price increases, but this will not allow us to control them. Control results from planning, and the use of self-study is a means to plan for change, plan for progress, plan for our individual and collective library development.

Indiana has contributed more toward the development of academic library self-study programs than any other state. Colleges and universities in the state of Indiana participated in the design and testing of two of the Office of Management Studies' self-studies. In 1972, Purdue University cooperated with two other Association of Research Libraries (Tennessee and Iowa State) to assist in developing and applying the Management Review and Analysis Program—the first of the OMS self-studies. In 1979, six small private liberal arts colleges and universities from Indiana<sup>2</sup> assisted in the development of the Planning Program for small academic libraries.

In addition to contributing toward the development of these self-studies, Indiana colleges and universities have initiated and conducted self-studies to a larger extent than any other state. Eleven other libraries have participated, are participating, or will participate in a self-study.<sup>3</sup> That is an incredible 18 institutions in one state alone, the most positive statement of commitment to planning that can be made.

Assisted self-study is a term more or less coined by the Office of Management Studies to describe its particular approach to planning. OMS began developing this approach in 1972 with a program called the Management Review and Analysis Program. It consists of a self-study with analysis and planning conducted by task forces composed primarily of librarians. The library also receives resources in the form of study manuals and guidelines, survey instruments, and other prepared materials, as well as consultation assistance from OMS.

That first program, the Management Review and Analysis Program, was designed expressly for large university libraries holding membership in the Association of Research libraries and was initially available only to them. The program's success however, led other academic libraries to request that it or a similar program be developed and made available.

In 1976, the Council on Library Resources responded to these requests by funding a project at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte to design and test a self-study procedure for mid and small sized academic libraries. The Office of Management Studies was consulted on the project; it played a large role in the design known as the Academic Library Development Program.

In 1977, the Office of Management Studies received a grant from the Andrew Mellon Foundation to develop a self-study process for universities to use in assessing and developing their collection resources. This program was

named the Collection Analysis Project. In 1978, the OMS received support from the Lilly Endowment to provide a program for small private liberal arts colleges and universities in Indiana and neighboring states. A fifth program is currently in final stages of development. This will focus on preservation of materials and improvement of preservation practices and management. It is being funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Two additional programs are in the planning stage, a service analysis procedure, and a program for community colleges.

All of these programs have certain elements in common. Each program however, focuses on specific needs and conditions. The common features basically involve the philosophy behind the assisted self-study approach and the overall strategy employed by the programs.

This basic strategy consists of analysis conducted by the study team and task forces. In the planning program for small academic libraries, faculty and administrators are also included on the study team. All have been developed around systematic analysis. All programs specify explicit steps which essentially involve data collection, analysis of data, and development of action-oriented programs in that order.

These should effect improvements and influence change positively. While the self-study is a significant element within all the OMS programs, it is the philosophical foundation that provides the basis for the approach. The six basic assumptions which underlie the OMS programs are:

1. that the library and the institution are interested in managing and directing change
2. that the library and the institution are committed to improvement and recognize that planning is essential to generating effective improvements
3. that the librarians, faculty, administrators, students, staff, possess the necessary knowledge and skills to assess needs and develop improvements
4. that widespread involvement will produce the best results—that is, the best analysis—because it taps many resources and generates innovative ideas
5. that meaningful involvement in the analysis of issues and in the development of improvement programs will generate commitment to implementation and thus enhance the probability of successful results
6. that planning must follow a systems approach and focus on achieving results

The systems emphasis and results-orientation within the study are based upon Kurt Olmosk's patterns.<sup>4</sup> Olmosk defines eight approaches to effecting change. These are:

1. *Fellowship*

Assumption: good, warm relationships will enhance agreement and promote problem solving.

2. *Political*

Assumption: if all the 'really' influential people agree that something should be done, it will be done.

3. *Economic*

Assumption: with enough money, most things can be changed.

4. *Academic*

Assumption: people are rational; if the facts are presented, changes will be adopted.

5. *Confrontation*

Assumption: it is sometimes necessary to take a hard stand to see that the problem is recognized and acknowledged. This will eventually produce results.

6. *Engineering*

Assumption: if the environment or surroundings are changed people will have to change.

7. *Military*

Assumption: physical force produces results; threats, sanctions, and coercion are sometimes necessary.

8. *The Applied Behavioral Science*

Assumption: different problems require different approaches and many problems require a combination of several approaches.

The OMS self-studies employ the Applied Behavioral Science Approach. That is, they recognize that all seven basic approaches have a place and that frequently several approaches are needed to bring about results. Thus, the programs utilize groups to promote fellowship and to provide opportunity for developing political influence. The programs also acknowledge the importance of economics as well as the significance of rational, factual analysis. In addition, the programs recognize that it is frequently necessary to confront the issues head-on and to take a stand. Finally, the OMS programs realize that in some instances change will result only if the situation is restructured or if sanctions are applied.

## Notes

1 Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock*. N.Y.: Random, 1970.

2 The six schools involved were Anderson, Manchester, St. Mary's, St. Meinrad's, Taylor, and Valparaiso.

3 The eleven are Indiana University, Ball State, DePauw, Earlham, Franklin, Goshen, Hanover, Huntington, St. Joseph, the University of Evansville, and Notre Dame.

4 Olmsk, Kurt E. "Seven Pure Strategies of Change," *Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators*, LaJolla, Calif: University Associates, 1972.

## MRAP: THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY EXPERIENCE FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF A FORMER STUDY TEAM CHAIR

*Betty Jo Irvine*

The Indiana University Libraries, Bloomington, participated in the Management Review and Analysis Program (MRAP) from September, 1974 until January, 1976 when the final report was submitted to the Dean of University Libraries. This paper summarizes (1) IU's reasons for participating in MRAP, (2) the objectives of MRAP for the University Libraries, and (3) the impact of MRAP.

(1) A number of factors both internal and external to the university libraries influenced IU's participation in MRAP. The internal factors were related to the creation of a new chief executive officer's position entitled Dean of University Libraries, the recent implementation of library faculty status for librarians, the systematic review of all personnel policies and clerical grades during 1973-74, and related activities to improve internal communications within the libraries. Appointed in the fall, 1972, the Dean of University Libraries arrived in January, 1973 filling a newly created post with administrative responsibilities for the entire IU system including Bloomington (IUB), the Regional Campus libraries, and the Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) libraries. The MRAP vehicle provided a process whereby all top administrative and middle management functions, relationships, responsibilities and authority lines could be reviewed and analyzed by the IUB staff, including professional and support members. The result of this process was a

final report which would provide the new Dean with a historical perspective regarding the growth and development of the present organizational structure of the libraries, an overview of recent changes in the libraries, and guidelines for future improvements as perceived by the professional and support staff.

By the middle of 1974, faculty status was fully operational but also in need of review, i.e., committees were proliferating, and there was confusion in the relationships among unit or department heads, the chief administrative officers, and the Bloomington Library Faculty Council (BLFC). In short, it was time to review the administrative advisory role of the BLFC. The appointment of a Personnel Librarian by July, 1973 resulted in a systematic review of all personnel policies, procedures and clerical grades, which was completed during 1974. In addition, a Support Staff Organization was formed and a flexible work-week policy was implemented for support staff. Within a relatively short period of time, many accomplishments had been made in the operation of the libraries' personnel functions. It was appropriate to review the implications of these actions, to modify or improve upon what had been accomplished, and most importantly, to recognize the value of our accomplishments. With the establishment of formal library faculty and support staff organizations, internal library communications had substantially improved. The establishment of a library newsletter increased horizontal and vertical communications within the library. The professional and support staff now had several vehicles for communicating with and advising the libraries' chief administrative officers. It was time to review the role the staff played in participatory management.

External factors which influenced IU's participation in MRAP related to the various economic pressures facing institutions of higher education at the beginning of the 1970's. Limited resources imposed a need for fiscal constraint and for long-range planning to optimize organizational structure and attendant library functions. MRAP represented a formalized system for review and analysis that could make the library more responsive to faculty, students, and the university and public communities.

During MRAP, interviews were held with the chief executive officers of the university. These interviews allowed a cross-section of the library staff to share library concerns and needs with university administrators. The university had recently completed a major long-range planning document and MRAP represented a planning tool for the libraries.

(2) The specific objectives of MRAP for IUB as defined by the Dean of University Libraries were: to examine the present managerial structure with a view toward possible change; to examine organizational relationships with a view toward possible change; to foster improved communications throughout the libraries; to formalize departmental objectives; and to recommend better utilization of personnel. With newly redefined administrative officers including the Dean, the Personnel Librarian, an Associate Dean, and other positions,

MRAP provided an opportunity to review how the management team functioned, how they related to each other and to middle management, and the span of control of each administrator. Overlapping functions between departments or library units, the division of reporting lines between related units or departments, and the relationships among the various administrative councils, the department heads, and the library faculty and support staff organizations were reviewed. The Study Team also considered whether or not additional administrative officers were needed to improve library management.

(3) MRAP's greatest impact was the process itself. Participation in MRAP forced all administrative officers, department heads and other middle management level staff to review their responsibilities, functions, and inter-relationships with other library units. The MRAP process stressed improved communications throughout the libraries. Nearly one-third of the entire staff was directly involved in MRAP, and at least fifty percent of the staff was involved at some point. Certainly, after MRAP there was an increased understanding of each unit's objectives.

As issues were raised during MRAP, changes were often made *before* MRAP could take credit for such changes. Changes which occurred during the MRAP process and which could be related to the process were numerous and often represented completed actions by the time the final report was submitted. For example, in a review of the 145 recommendations which were made in the final report, seventy-four percent of these recommendations had received a positive response and/or specific library administration action taken prior to the writing of the report. By the end of the MRAP period, twenty-six percent of these recommendations would be identified as completed actions or actions in the process of completion and/or review. Since the completion of MRAP in 1975, about ten percent of the original recommendations have been acted upon by members of the administrative group.

MRAP provided the libraries with a historical document on the administrative and organizational evolution of the system. The final report summarized a vast amount of information about the libraries which might otherwise be inaccessible or possibly unavailable in the future. Thus, the final report was intended not only to document a pattern of change but also one of accomplishment for the IU Libraries.

Immediately after completion of MRAP, the initial reaction was one of fatigue and a desire not to discuss the report; however, IU did hold open hearings on the final report, and it also routed through all units of the library. Although a great many changes had already taken place within a relatively short period of time, it would be unreasonable to expect MRAP to alter a system which had evolved over more than 150 years.

Numerous benefits can be derived from MRAP, not the least of which include the evolution of an environment for constructive change within the



library, improved communications within and without the library, and an awareness of library priorities based upon diverse staff input. Although designed as an internal study, MRAP forces a library to relate to, and to justify its operations as they affect users. By improving the internal organization and management of the library, improved services should result.

MANAGEMENT REVIEW AND ANALYSIS PROGRAM  
AT BALL STATE UNIVERSITY

*Nyal Williams*

Ball State University's Department of Library Service is approximately two-thirds through the projected MRAP time schedule. As Study Team Chairman, I am relieved with the knowledge that all libraries have similar problems. Indeed, when our group interviewed other librarians who had conducted similar studies, we began to feel that we might just adopt their reports and recommendations and consider our problems solved. You will recognize your own profile when you read any MRAP report.

Until 1965, Ball State was a teacher's college with an enrollment of roughly 2500 students. Since that time it has become a university of five colleges with enrollment exceeding 18,000. There is a new thrust in the institution. Teacher training receives less emphasis, and two colleges, architecture and business, are gaining attention from both students seeking these majors and budget officers supporting their burgeoning programs.

The economic outlook across the country and in Indiana calls for increased efficiencies in the use of all resources, including material and personnel. Those who were already efficient will most probably be strained in their adaptation to the new realities.

Our library reached its peak in staffing two years ago. At that time we had forty-five librarians and ninety-five support staff members. We are now beginning to lose positions through attrition. The library was moved into a new building in 1975. Our present structure has five floors, each the size of a football field. In 1979 we celebrated the acquisition of our millionth volume. The

library has five specialized collections within the main library building, and an exceptionally large media collection; there are three physically separate branch libraries.

Ball State has recently experienced a change in the administrative guard. We have a new president, a new provost, two new vice-presidents, and three new deans. Most are new to Ball State. These officers have brought new ideas about university management and about the function of the library within the university. In addition, the current organizational structure was created to fit the needs of the old, improperly arranged building. The new building contains the collection and uses the personnel differently. Although reorganization has been discussed since the move into the new building, nothing has been done.

In 1969, seven divisions were created; these are Information Sources, General Collections, Collection Development, Processing, Continuations, Educational Resources, and Branch Libraries. During the past five or six years there has been a growth of divisional autonomy. Each division has developed its own stance concerning such matters as organization, automation, work flow, internal management style. Since these were in conflict at times, negotiation has been difficult and painful. The communication across divisional lines concerning policies, operational decisions, and other matters has become a constant source of difficulty and irritation.

The introduction of automation requires examination of assignments, job descriptions, and job classification. Staff lines which have been eliminated through attrition may not be the proper ones to abandon. Librarians at Ball State have faculty status, nine month contracts, and, up to this point, summer employment options. While faculty status has many benefits for librarians, including professional prestige with the teaching faculty, more opportunity for academic discussions, and more involvement in campus politics, it also creates problems. Monies for summer salaries have been cut back to the point that summer staffing is a problem. Supervision of the support staff is inadequate during that time, and the lack of reference librarians and other librarians serving library functional needs is felt.

The teaching faculty's role has been unclear in our library, and the management control has not been resolved. This has led to a hazy notion concerning authority and responsibility and has created an uneasy feeling that the two might not coincide. Occasionally, decisions are wrangled over, or sometimes they are made by or attributed to the wrong party.

Our study team completed a general analysis that includes a study of trends in higher education and in libraries, an environmental study of the library in its institutional setting, and issued an Interim Report. As a result, six task forces on organization, leadership and supervision, communication, planning and budgeting, personnel, and automation and technology have been established. The first three task forces have completed their work, and the remaining three

are in the midst of their assignments. When all the reports are in, the Study Team will correlate the findings in a Final Report. Included will be a set of recommendations for change.

The Office of Management Studies has emphasized repeatedly that the greatest benefit from this exercise will be learning to use the method for continued improvement, that the process itself will be more important than any recommendations the Study Team might make. Our librarians expect the recommendations to solve Ball State problems; they perceive the recommendations to be the only benefit to be gained by the library from the MRAP.

I have seen the process at work. Librarians must be willing to develop lists of alternatives and to analyze them carefully before settling on a solution. They must be willing to discuss alternatives deemed impractical and to hold objective discussions with much less emotion. These skills are necessary to any real planning effort. Self-study is a difficult task, but significant educational benefits can be gained from the process. In the long run this can be far more important than specific recommendations which come out of the study.

### Note

Johnson, Edward R. Stuart H. Mann. *Organization Development for Academic Libraries: An Evaluation of the Management Review and Analysis Program*, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1980, 62.

---

*Larry Hardesty is Head of the Reference Department at the Roy O. West Library, DePauw University.*

*Dr. Grady Morein has a Masters in Library Science, a MBA, and a PhD in management. Currently serving as University Librarian at the University of Evansville, Dr. Morein had previously worked at the Office of Management Studies.*

*Mrs. Betty Jo Irvine is currently Fine Arts Librarian at Indiana University. From 1974-75 she served as Assistant Director in charge of the Management Review and Analysis Program at I.U. She is completing her PhD at Indiana University School of Library and Information Science.*

*Dr. Nyal Williams, Music Librarian At Ball State University, has an MSLS and a doctorate in Musicology. He served as chair of the Ball State Self Study Team.*