Question 1

Interviewer: So we'll start with No. 1, and No. 1 is just really an opportunity for you to kind of free wheel, if you will, about your background and your experience and your management philosophy.

Interviewee: Okay, well, I've been in academic libraries a little over 30 years and I've worked at three or four different places – oh, I guess four different places, and I've always come to academic libraries from a perspective more as a public library **[library perspective]**. In fact, I thought I was gonna go into public libraries in the '60s and '70s to do the kind of outreach work, and building programs, and changing people's lives **[motivation – career]**, and making information available and count in people's lives.

So I brought that philosophy to my academic library experience. And I was an intern at the University of AA when I went to library school there and my first job was in the Government Documents Department at AB University. And then I went to the University of AC where I was a reference instruction librarian and eventually became assistant chancellor, dealing with computing, libraries and all student services **[span of control]**.

Interviewer: This was at AC?

Interviewee: Yeah.

Interviewer: Yeah, okay.

Interviewee: Then I went to the University of AD as the head of public services and deputy director, and then to the University of AE. I've been very interested in leadership, and management, and developmental change. My husband's an Academic2 so I've read a lot and been aware of literature on how organizations change. And so that sort of is the background, the wanting to be relevant to the community **[motivation – career]** and understanding organizational change, focus on the user, and not on things, which it has sometimes been controversial, and over my career, I guess, known for shaking things up **[management style]**.

So that's sort of the background I bring. We've moved to team based management **[management – approach]** and have devolved

[empowerment] a lot of sharing of decision making in the libraries where I've been and involved people.

Interviewer: Okay. I have been asking kind of a baseline question, which may seem obvious, and sort of a follow-up here. In your understanding of innovation, do you consider it something that is essential for academic librarians to understand how to do?

Interviewee: Yeah, but my approach to this has always been that we should be focused on helping out community be better [vision]. And our role in that is to take what we learned as librarians, and the skills, and the philosophical approach to information, our whole sort of values framework, and applying that then to helping our communities achieve their goals; in this case, higher education and better learning and research, and so focusing on that. And so if you focus on that, you have to be innovative.

You can't stay on pat with the same old hand and the same old services because users change and you need to anticipate what they need and what they're gonna need, rather than waiting for them to completely change and then demand the service.

Question 2

Interviewer: Yeah. Okay, let's move onto No. 2, and this is sort of a similar question but it's really looking more broadly at your kind of library. How would you describe the management culture in your library?

Interviewee: Well, as I said, we've devolved a lot of decision-making. We've tried to move decisions to the point in the organization where the people have the most knowledge and not try to run everything up the flagpole to be approved and then back down [flatten organization]. We use a lot of cross-functional teams [organizational structure] and give them actual decision-making power. There are portions of the budget that individuals make decisions over once they're allocated. There's a budget process that involves a broad representative base of the organization in making the decisions [decision making].

So, we're not perfect; we still have lots of things that we need to learn to do better, but I think that there is a fair amount of

	involvement. At the end of next week, we will have trained 75 people in project management skills **[job specialists]**.
Interviewer:	How did you do that, by the way, is it by a formal course?
Interviewee:	I brought in Consultant1 from AF, who's nationally known for doing project management training, and he's done three-day sessions here three times.
Interviewer:	Okay. Let me just follow up. Really, this notion of pushing decisions out to the end point, if you will, to people where the knowledge is.
Interviewee:	Good.
Interviewer:	How does that work? The reason I ask is you can read a lot in library literature about fairly structured job responsibilities and the kind of reluctance to move out of those rigid decisions or rigid sort of structures. Has this devolution worked reasonably well, in your mind?
Interviewee:	It's worked in some units better than others. Some units are really very good at it. And we still have others that don't want any decisions made without their input that they wouldn't like, but want kind of quote, "managers," rather than leaders making decisions so that they're sort of not faced with the unpopular impact, but it works very well on cross-functional teams **[flatten organization]**. We just restructured last year again **[pace – organizational change]**, and in this restructuring, we divided our librarians into a research support services team and into an undergraduate services team with some new functions and we split out special collections and we don't know for sure what we're gonna do with them, but we're still working on that.
	But looking at research support services, really focusing on upper division graduate and faculty, and really getting out there, being more partners **[collaboration]**, taking people off desks so that they're out in the community identifying community resources. We have a surprising number of journals that are published on this campus, so we're getting to work with them and bring those into the institutional repository and figuring out, first, just how to get the back files up, and then moving from that kind of thing to how

do we manage the current issues, to now, well, maybe we can get Ecommerce and help them by managing their subscription service.

Interviewer: Okay. These are journals that the University of AE is publishing?

Interviewee: Yeah, one of our Academic1 Department publishes something like radiocarbon, and they've been doing it for 30 years. We have a center for research in the Region1 that publishes a journal of the Region1 and we have a student group and anthropology graduate students that publish kind of an archaeology journal called Journal1 **[new service]**.

Interviewer: And you're bringing those into the –

Interviewee: We're bringing those in and we're negotiating with a couple of other journals on campus right now.

Interviewer: Okay. On the cross-function team, so like the undergraduate support, you would have people, librarians, staff from the various, if you will, traditional groups or are these primarily public services?

Interviewee: Yeah, these are public services. What they're doing is they're focusing on designing modules that – first of all, the cross-functional team is the team working, for example, on our course management system and integrating the library course management system, which will have people from undergraduate services, but also from document delivery and also from access services.

But the undergraduate services team would be heavily responsible for developing modules to go into the course management system. They're beginning to work on one-credit online courses; they're doing outreach. We've designed an umbrella software package too called Project1, which links to over 100 websites on campus where University of AE faculty have created content for K through 12 education. And so we have designed ways to search those sites that search across them and that we link to them **[new service]**. And we want to get out and start publicizing those and getting people into them, and then work on working with the faculty to improve those, as well as perhaps create new ones.

Interviewer: Okay, all right. Just one other question here on No. 2. You mentioned software and re-design; you're tapping into software development resources, and where are those resources?

Interviewee: Yeah, I mean we get some programming up in our digital library group who create this, but if there is commercial software available, we obviously try to buy it, but we do do some programming. I'm <u>nervous about that</u> **[perspective – programming]**, but we do do some.

Interviewer: Okay, just one other aspect here. Do you see the ratio of professional librarians to staff changing in your library?

Interviewee: Yeah. Well, we've had a lot of budget cuts in the last 18 years.

Interviewer: State1 has a real serious budget problem **[environment – budget]**, so we know what those are like.

Interviewee: Yeah. And we're expecting more cuts. We've done a lot of process improvement work to streamline our processes, so some of the cuts we could absorb because we eliminated work. It's harder and harder to do that, although we're still – for example, we will eliminate electronic reserves by this time next year. But we've lost more staff positions and we've got a growing body of professional but non-faculty positions **[staff profile]**.

Interviewer: Okay, okay. Yeah, that's sort of what I'm getting at. Maybe it's the ratio of faculty librarians to other professional positions.

Interviewee: Right.

Interviewer: Yeah. And you're saying that the profession non faculty positions are maybe increasing relative to the [faculty librarians] –

Interviewee: Yes.

Question 3

Interviewer: That's my perception here, but I mean I haven't done any quantitative studies on it so I just kind of wanted to throw that out as well. Okay, let's move to No. 3. Libraries are typically members of peer groups, and I'm just wondering in your peer group of university libraries who you see as being maybe most like

you. How do you see the University of AE library being unique or different from your peer group?

Interviewee: Well, I think that we've constantly been under budget pressure **[external environment]** so that we early on had to make decisions in order not to just continually decline everywhere, so we've had more budget cuts but we've never applied them across the board, so we use process improvement. We improved the shelving in the library, for example, that was really atrocious. After the first of the semester, it took weeks for books to get back to the shelves. And we've got that down now to 11 or 15 hours and we're probably spending 100 to 150,000.00 less on students **[process improvement – objective]**.

And we went to shelf ready books early with Consultant2; we were probably the first library to do that, and so we could eliminate copy-cataloging staff. And so we've done things like that. We're an all-electronic government documents library now **[fundamental change]**.

Interviewer: Oh, really.

Interviewee: Yeah. So we have one librarian who maybe spends a few hours a month checking up on our government documents.

Interviewer: Okay, this has got my interest here. I mean what about all of the older government documents?

Interviewee: Well, we've got a legacy collection, but we're weeding the legacy collection as we go along as we can find either where some of the stuff has been replaced with digitization and/or some other format. So we've been weeding the legacy collection.

Interviewer: Okay, okay. I, by the way, read your article from 1996, Article1, and in this category, I mean one of things that I'm tracking here is collaboration, and a point you make there is – the quote goes something like this, "Librarians have superficial relationships with other libraries."

Interviewee: Right, that's something I've said now, and even in the latest thing, in the – I think it's the Journal of Library Administration, or something like that. Interlibrary loan is a Band-Aid. It's a recognition that we didn't have all the money we should have to

buy whatever we needed for our campus, and therefore, for this failure, we have to do interlibrary loans. And then, if you make agreements, you keep this, I'll keep that, pretty soon, if I get an increase, I buy back what you were supposed to be keeping for me, and I think we've done that all across the country.

And we haven't put really until, oh, I would say the last few years, any real money in making interlibrary loan better **[collaboration]**. It was almost like, well, we'll show them. If they don't give us enough money, we'll eventually probably get this, but it'll be such pain that faculty will complain. And so we've been working, for example, we were an early partner with Project2 at AG [University] and we gathered lots of data and worked with them and I think have helped them significantly improve that system **[fundamental change]**.

Until now, within the Region2 lines, almost all of us are in Project2 and we are getting turnaround times of 24 hours **[process improvement – objective]** for articles, and so we have really started putting money into that, and we need to see it as not a failure, but a way of leveraging dollars. So that's what I'm talking about, but I still think this collaborative collection development **[collaboration]**, developing the national collections, we talk about it a lot, but not very many of us are really very serious about it **[collaboration – not working]**.

Interviewer: So what is going on here, in your view? I mean my interest here, by the way, is –one of the ways that innovations occurs, and people have used the word borrowing, for example, or the technology term is technology transfer, but you need collaboration to do this. And so I really picked up on this statement and I was just wondering what your view of what is really the blockage here in development unit relationships that would further these things, like a national collection?

Interviewee: Well, I think it's still the <u>clinging to the library of the past</u> **[professionalism – traditions]**. I mean in my library, we were the first library to remove the Org1 print. We sent some of it to Org2 and we continue to move the Org1 print. With our budget, we were the first library to go to Org3 and say, "We are not buying both print and electronic." And they said, "Well, okay, then you have to <u>buy directly from us instead of Org4</u> **[management – pushback]**." And we said, "Okay, here's the list of things that

Org4 does for us. We'll buy directly from if you promise to do these things.

So, they said, "Oh, well, go ahead and buy the electronic from Org4." Now, maybe it was just the timing, that if we'd done it a year earlier, they would have laughed in our face, I have no idea, but we've done those kinds of things.

Interviewer: But did this initiative come from library leadership, or from grassroots, or from both?

Interviewee: It comes from both. A lot of the ideas come from people who know a whole lot more about what's going on than I do.

Interviewer: Yeah, okay.

Interviewee: What other things we really have different here to is in the classified staff we have systematically over the last 17 years taken them off of routine tasks and we have moved them up to <u>utilizing their potential</u> **[staff – growth]**. And now many of them, we gave them money, many of them go to ALA and they go to conferences, they stay on top of what's going on in their areas. We've really expanded what we could do because we unleashed a huge potential that was – and they take part in decisions and they're equal partners with librarians.

Question 4

Interviewer: Okay, all right. Okay, let's move onto No. 4. I just wanted to get sort of how you would characterize or describe innovation in your own words.

Interviewee: I'll use an example. I see innovation coming from synthesis, from looking at what's out there and <u>bringing things together in new ways rather</u> **[innovation - synthesis]** than looking at what's out there and analyzing or breaking it apart into discreet units. So when we problem solve, I try to get us to problem solve from a synthesis point of view, what is it we can bring together and bring to this and do differently to solve our problems.

Interviewer: Okay, that suggests bringing things, whatever, processes, technology from outside into the library?

Interviewee: Right.

Question 5

Interviewer: Okay. So, moving onto No. 5 here, either within your own library or other libraries that you've had experience with, can you cite some projects that you feel were very innovative, either current ones or historic ones?

Interviewee: Well, like I said, I think being the first library to get <u>shelf ready books</u> **[innovation]**, or at least academic library. I know that the publics and the school libraries were doing it, but I think we <u>stole it</u> **[innovation – borrowing]** from them and showed that it could be done. We restructured, as I said, how we do our shelving and we brought our turnaround times down **[process – objective]** and saved money at the same time. Again, we were one of the first libraries to remove print **[innovation - process improvement]** and to insist that we weren't gonna bundle print and electronic in our purchases. We are streaming video now to hundreds of classrooms a semester.

Interviewer: This is like a partnership with your campus IT?

Interviewee: No, we were working with the Learning Technology Center for a while and they couldn't do what we needed done so we figured out a way to do it, but we did work with them for a while. We had not the first, but perhaps one of the biggest information commons **[innovation – space]** built with lots of classrooms and workstations configured so that several people could gather around the computer and lots of extra chairs around so that people could gather together and work together.

Interviewer: Now, on that, I mean and this is something that our library's struggling with, where did you get the space?

Interviewee: Well, we were lucky because they were building a classroom building underground and we got them to attach it to the library.

Interviewer: Ah, okay. Yeah, see, we know we need to do that here, but it's hard finding the space.

Interviewee: Well, we took out print, by taking out print all over the library to create more student space **[innovation – space management]**, and I'm getting rewarded with more students in that space.

Interviewer: Okay. So, just going back, the shelf ready books, this in effect, if I understood this right, is sort of again, pulling a process or a technology from public libraries.

Interviewee: Right.

Interviewer: It's interesting. It seems like public libraries move faster in some of these areas than academic libraries.

Interviewee: Yes.

Interviewer: Any comment on why that is?

Interviewee: I think they're community focused. Many academic libraries, while they see themselves supporting research and learning going on on campus, they also see themselves as a good or and end in and of themselves **[professionalism – librarians]**. And I think that there's part of that in their sense of where they are in the national scene and building up the library as a good that should be on campus whether or not we're really doing as much good as we should be doing in terms of day-to-day.

Interviewer: Oh, interesting. So that attitude could be construed as actually suppressing innovation.

Interviewee: It could.

Question 6

Interviewer: Yeah, okay. All right, that's a very comment. Let's go onto No. 6. I've been reading a lot of library literature, specifically history, and actually been looking for accounts of innovations that have failed.

Interviewee: Yeah, we don't write those up very much.

Interviewer: Say again.

Interviewee: We don't write those up very much.

Interviewer: That's exactly my point.

Interviewee: But we had one; we partnered with seven libraries on the Project3 with Consultant3 and what we were really trying to achieve was a federated searching system that would eventually also do I think the kind of thing that In Read does but less expensive, and that now OCLC, Worldcat and Navigator, the folks that were going Navigator.

Anyhow, so this was seven years ago, maybe eight, and we did it for three years at a cost of 25,000 a year.

Interviewer: This was –?

Interviewee: All of us. We didn't end up with a product that did what we wanted, but we did end up capturing the attention of people who were building products, **metalive** and – so the things that we learned. We learned a lot ourselves and improved our skills **[innovation – byproduct]**. The things we learned also translated to other commercial vendors who at first weren't interested, and then were really ticked that we were doing this, but it did modify their product.

So, in and of itself, we didn't end up with a product that could be marketed, but we did end up in changing the products that were out there and the way people thought about some of those.

Interviewer: Okay, yeah. One of the sort of general thoughts about innovations is you never not quite know when it stops. And just because a particular project failed, the elements of it can continue in other pieces, which it sounds like this is what happened in this case. Let me just ask you about – well, let me give you an example. One of the things that we started doing at the labs is having open discussions of failed projects. Did you do this or have you thought about doing that for – or maybe you don't have many a failed project; we have a lot of failed projects.

Interviewee: Well, I mean we try to remind people that there's failed projects and there's failed projects. This failed project did lead to the kinds of things that you can't prove, but we're pretty certain it did, and it led to an improvement in the products out there that we eventually could buy, and we did talk about that. And some of our process improvements, we tried several different kinds of things. We were

one of the first to work with Org4 on their, I'm blanking on the name it, their inter library loan document delivery service.

And we were deep into it in partnership **[risk taking]** and working closely with them, and we saw a press announcement that they pulled the plug on it, and we had to scramble to – because we were heavily into alternative ways of delivering stuff to our campus and really needed to do that. So that didn't work so good and what we learned is that Org4's a company and they were investing money there and they didn't see any real long-term profit, although I think I was spending a couple hundred thousand a year with them as we were working on this.

That probably didn't make the literature either. But I know there's people across the country that have flirted around with video steaming; sometimes they just get all overwhelmed in the copyright issues and sometimes I mean there are technology issues. It took us a year, year and a half of continuing to watch what was out there that we might adopt and use **[innovation – borrowing]**, and how we might do this, and continually looking for how can we do this under a copyright, rather than, oh, is this not doable under copyright. It's how you approach it.

Interviewer: Yeah, yeah. Well, one of the things I'm trying to understand here, I mean if you can remove the – well, let me back up.

Interviewee: Libraries are afraid to fail; they're very risk adverse **[perspective – risk]**.

Interviewer: Yeah, that's exactly the cultural issue here. And sort of one of my premises is you can't really innovate if you're not prepared to fail.

Interviewee: Right, you can't. And Consultant4, if you look it up, he talks about libraries being risk adverse and how computing centers are almost risk seeking and that we have to move somewhere in between, and I think he's written that up in articles and stuff too. And I think Consultant5, I mean there's again – I was just in ARL yesterday and one library director introduced me to a new library director and said, "Oh, you know, FN1 is very innovative in AE, really doing a lot of stuff. We all watch what FN1's doing."

And I said, "Yeah, they all watch what FN1's doing. Nobody says, gee, that's a great idea; they watch **[risk averse – process]**. And if

I don't get fired a year after I do it, then they start doing it." And she laughed and she says, "Yep, that's just what we do."

Interviewer: Yeah, this is exactly I think – I mean it's good that some libraries, like your libraries, take a step out, but I think it sort of has to permeate the culture.

Interviewee: Well, it's the culture of a university **[environment – institution]**. I mean there's a quote that one of my former presidents used to use that in a university, nothing should ever happen for the first time, and that's a quote from an Oxford professor in 1400s, so we're in kind of risk adverse environments.

Interviewer: Yeah, it's in my mind a really significant issue here.

Interviewee: But we can't succeed if we don't start doing something.

Question 7

Interviewer: Yeah, no, I agree. So moving onto No. 7. So I'm looking to try to understand the policies and practices within your own library that you feel had facilitated or might help innovation.

Interviewee: We give people access to an incredible amount of information on just about everything **[policy – information sharing]**. So if they want to know what's going on in the library, they can, and we encourage them to be active, to look out at what's going on, to see how it applies to their work. We give them some decision-making power in groups **[empowerment – groups]**; we use cross-functional teams to build up expertise and break down silos **[management approach]** on particular projects that we're working on.

I think we've created a fund, which is probably gonna get eaten up now by budget cuts, but I hope not, of a Amount1 where people can put in proposals for new ideas **[R&D investment]**.

Interviewer: This is right on one of my follow-up questions here. So, can you just elaborate a little more, I mean if I were a professional librarian, how would I take advantage of this?

Interviewee: You would come forward with a project description, budget. You'd probably get a couple of people who want to work with you

on this and you'd come forward to staff a strategic planning group and you would explain why this idea might important strategically for the library, what would be the outcome, how long it would take, and you ask for some money **[R&D process]**.

Interviewer: Okay. Let me just follow up on this I've noticed there's some beginnings of a vocabulary in university libraries that we used a lot in my previous career, it's referring to something, a project, as an R & D project, where there was typically some uncertainty in whether the project could be pulled off, there was some technical uncertainty or maybe some process issues or what have you. Would you characterize this in that sense as sort of an R & D project?

Interviewee: It's not mostly. It could be; it's not mostly.

Interviewer: What I'm looking for is, in a loose, I call R & D investment in projects that do not have a certain outcome.

Interviewee: Well, we've done a fair number of those, for example, when we digitized our first journal, so backgrounds. We did it for free thing, if you make these available to open access, we'll do it for free for you because they want them done to get the visibility. But we didn't know what our long-term plan on all this is so it evolves over time. Maybe there are other journals that's evolving towards – we took over managing even the current issues, but we didn't take care of the subscriptions, we just made the current issues available to certain IP addresses, and now we're looking at, well, do we do this, do we do Ecommerce, do we facilitate this process on campus.

So, there's some things that we try to just to see can we do it, is this gonna work, how hard is this gonna be, what's the long-term consequences. And there are folks in the library that see that we've done a number of these and say, well, we got a lot of little onesy, twosies, threesies out there. But this does not a concerted plan make, and we need to clean this up, and so there's that drive versus – and we need to listen to that and at some point focus, versus – I try to keep the door open to as much experimentation as possible until we see is it gonna work or not, and I'm willing to pull the plug if it doesn't work **[project management]**.

Interviewer:	So it's fair to say that whether you call it R & D or not, a certain amount of your budget goes into experimentation where the outcome is not necessarily known.
Interviewee:	Yes.

Question 8

Interviewer:	Yeah, okay. Okay, let's just move onto No. 8. We kind of touched on this a little bit, but sort of looking at people here, what do you consider to be important innovation behaviors?
Interviewee:	Well, again, I describe it as where people can look out can synthesize **[behavior]**, they can see things going on and they can see possibilities bringing things together and having people – I think we need good relationships with faculty, we need relationships with other units on campus, which we had. A risk taking **[behavior]**, obviously, people who aren't afraid to try something and if it doesn't work, don't feel like they'll be severely punished. And in terms of real innovations, I think you look at MIT and the library's Dspace and being involved with getting the faculty curriculum online and the library being very involved in that, being a driver **[behavior – initiative]**.
	I'm not sure what's come of it yet, but I think what Purdue is doing with e-Science and trying to build up that capability is innovative; I think it's important for this program.
Interviewer:	On the people issue, I mean you will see a fair amount of literature again that says that technology, and specifically computer technology, is a major enabler for innovation.
Interviewee:	I think that's true. I think it does enable people to think about things differently. When we were pretty much relying on what we had on campus, and it was difficult to identify anything that you didn't already own, let alone get it, you develop an insular focus on the library. And I think now with the communications technologies, it not only allows us to do different things, but quite frankly, it's allowing communication among librarians and other people that never happened before **[technology – enabler]**.
Interviewer:	Yeah. So let me ask you a question about librarians here. A lot of them, the professional librarians, do not typically have a

technology background; some of them probably could be characterized as technology phobic. Do you think this will hinder innovation or is there something that needs to be done there?

Interviewee: Well, we had a couple of librarians come last year that came from smaller institutions but were quite technology savvy and energetic, and they put together a series, they called them Friday afternoon socials **[process innovation]**. So Friday afternoon they put an hour or an hour and half where they were teaching other librarians how to do a pod case, how to use Web 2.0, Facebook, and lots of librarians showed up at that. There's an online digital certificate from our library school that's 18 credits **[technology – training]** and I'm sending four people to that.

Interviewer: Professional librarians?

Interviewee: Two professional librarians and two staff.

Interviewer: Oh, okay. Yeah, I mean this reeducation, if you will, seems to me to be really essential because there is just so much in a technology domain.

Interviewee: And we just hired a brand new position of assistant director for library technology strategy **[job specialty]**. That's a staff position, but it's really gonna be focused on looking at all the possibilities out there and helping us think through what should be our track.

Interviewer: Did this person, by the way, have an MLS degree?

Interviewee: Yes.

Question 9

Interviewer: Okay, okay. All right, let's move on. We're coming down here to that. Just on No. 9, we talked a little bit about the institution changing, but there are these what I call social groups, to a certain extent, users, but we have the traditional faculty staff, students, and we have these disciplinary areas, humanity, social science, that have been with us for years and years and I'm just wondering if you see any change in those or any new groups emerging.

Interviewee: Well, this campus is focused a lot on interdisciplinary work; they like to think that that's one of their strengths, and so that I think is

tending to expand rather than contract, and it's hard because the traditional departments are losing some of their political power and resources.

Interviewer: How does this affect the library, do you think?

Interviewee: Well, for us it's I think people know their own literatures and they know their own outstanding researches. As they get more interdisciplinary **[scholarship – interdisciplinary]**, they need to learn more about other literatures. And so some of the online stuff we've done and hopefully the research support services team will pick this up and we'll use this as a way to be even more invaluable to campus researchers.

Question 10

Interviewer: Yeah, okay. I mean in my own research, for example, I'm getting into philosophy, for example, and you could just see this happening. And a librarian that's been well established in a single discipline, now that's gonna take some change. Okay, let's move on to No. 10. You may know this, that I have a quote from you.

Interviewee: Yes.

Interviewer: But the quotations here, I just sort of want to get your response. Jesse Shera has written an awful lot and he's basically saying librarians are not able to see their work as a real profession. Martell is saying we need to create new services. And you, that quote is really looking at the organization and what the organization has to do. So maybe you can start with Jesse Shera and just get your responses to anything that comes to mind.

Interviewee: Well, I've got a lot of Jesse stuff and I think Jesse and some of the people who were writing in the '60s were PhDs and they were focuses on trying to professionalize, have a philosophy and theory of librarianship, and he's written a lot of stuff about that. It's interesting that he was writing this in the '60s because here's what happened in the '60s. You had a tremendous growth. You had the Korean War being nowhere with another round of veterans going to school. We had a tremendous growth; the baby boomers were hitting college. You had a tremendous number of new universities being created or teacher's colleges being turned into universities and huge amounts of money going into library collections.

And they couldn't turn out librarians fast enough for all the jobs that were available. And so it was a time of change because you begin to move – we still had this focus on the collections, especially in research libraries, a strong, strong focus on the collections, but you really begin to get the first service focus in librarianship, and the reference desks really being created because you had all this much more stuff and all these much more kids who needed help. So you get that change going on, which was kind of a massive change, I think, for librarians **[historical perspective]**.

And you had the beginning; it took another ten years for it to become a strong movement, but the beginnings of a library instruction movement, so you were moving at that time. He's talking about earlier times where people are focused on their catalogues, and identifying resources, and collecting and building collections, and processing those collections, and then circulating those collections.

He's talking about librarians of an earlier time; not the changes that began in the '60s and the new people coming in, the baby boomers coming in, who I think many were different, a new infusion.

Interviewer: So if I looked at this statement today, I mean his point he's trying to make is, I think, librarians are very process oriented.

Interviewee: And they were because he's looking at this ordering stuff and this processing stuff.

Interviewer: Yeah.

Interviewee: And that's what most librarians did.

Interviewer: So do you think the librarian of today understands the deeper meaning of their profession?

Interviewee: Well, I don't know, but when I teach at the library school, and when I was on Org6, and when I talk to people, I'm one of the people who say we need people really grounded in the values of philosophy in librarianship **[professionalism – librarianship]**. And that if they have that, and if they understand that framework, and then they come to our environment, sure, they're gonna have

stuff that they have to learn, and they need to come with some amount of technical skill nowadays, they will be prepared to focus on the user and to use their skills and knowledge in that way, where to transition.

And we still have people who remember building the great collections and who mourn that, except in the big places that are still building the great collections. So, do I think today – I think that we're in an in between stage and we have a lot of new people in, we're in a <u>transition period</u> **[organizational change – closure]** and it's uneven, but I think we're moving in the right direction.

Interviewer: So I need to touch on something you referred to here. I mean I agree with you here, they need to understand philosophy and the values. The question here is, how are our library schools helping to do this, or are they?

Interviewee: I think that they are. I think they spend a fair amount of time in their curriculum on these issues. They get batted back and forth on these issues, but I think most library schools at least try.

Interviewer: Yeah. Okay.

Interviewee: Well, and Charlie of course wrote, what is it, the client centered library, or something like that.

Interviewer: Yeah. Can you think of services that were unthinkable in the 20th Century that we're doing now?

Interviewee: I mean I think many of the services we're doing now; we're just doing differently.

Interviewer: Sorry, say again.

Interviewee: I think a lot of the services we're doing now were services but we're just doing them differently; we can be much more effective at it. I mean we always wanted to be integrated into the fabric of the curriculum and at the course level, and that wasn't very practical with the size of staffs and other kinds of issues. Now with course management systems it's entirely possible if we have the vision, and the drive, and the commitment.

Interviewer: You mentioned digitizing your first journal.

Interviewee:	Yeah. I think we will be publishing **[new service]**. But see I thought that the early libraries were publishers. Over time, to a greater or lesser extent, libraries have been publishers. For example, public libraries always did sort of pamphlets and things on community resources and stuff to hand in their community on jobs, which wasn't necessarily how to go look up something in the Department of Labor materials, but was really jobs resources in the community. They created resources and they published information about those resources.
Interviewer:	So this is possibly a service that I mean they didn't really do though in the 20th Century, like publishing journals.
Interviewee:	No, we didn't publish journals.
Interviewer:	Or maybe we did something similar.
Interviewee:	No, but I mean I think that we have been in the publishing business on and off throughout the history of libraries.
Interviewer:	So this is –
Interviewee:	We're enabled to do more things.
Interviewer:	Okay. So you wouldn't consider, for example, publishing journals being too far afield, if you will, in terms of the mission of the library.
Interviewee:	I don't.
Interviewer:	Yeah, okay. Now, on your quote here, I'd be very interested to learn what the response to this article was, it was published in 1996.
Interviewee:	Oh, well, the whole response to our restructuring in this article, which partially came out of that trying to elevate it a little. I mean there were people who thought I was crazy.
Interviewer:	Say again.
Interviewee:	They thought I was crazy.

Interviewer: Yeah, okay.

Interviewee: I told Consultant5 a year ago, after her Library of Congress study on bibliographic control came out and she was being so vilified, I said, "FN2, three, four, five years from now, nobody will remember what you said or that people were negative about it, they'll only remember that you are very famous and they'll want to hear what you have to say."

Interviewer: Yeah.

Interviewee: I mean everybody bet I was gonna get fired.

Interviewer: Is that right?

Interviewee: Oh, yeah, with all the restructuring here and we moved everybody around, we reassigned virtually everybody. We changed over the structure of the library **[organizational change]**. We began on process improvement. FN3 wrote a really nasty editorial in the *Journal.* I think he was editing the *Journal of Academic Libraries* at the time.

Interviewer: Responding to your article?

Interviewee: No, before the article, but responding to our changes. And I think there were people that saw this and saw a need for change. Shortly thereafter, we did our living the future conference and we had 150 people come. Some came for three days, seeing if they could talk to staff and get the real scoop and find out this clearly didn't work. People were very threatened **[impact of change]**.

Interviewer: Yes, I could imagine.

Interviewee: So it threatened all of the **[inaudible]** jobs; it threatened whose careers had been based on something else.

Question 11

Interviewer: Well, that's sort of what I expected. Let me just – we're running a little over time here, but question No. 11, to a certain extent, you could probably conclude of the sort of four major types of libraries, the school, the public, the special, the academic, given people's knowledge of using technology in an academic environment, you

might think that an academic library is maybe most threatened. I'm just wondering what you see as a major threat going forward to the continued success of the academic library.

Interviewee: I think it's short sidedness (sightedness), inability to take calculated risks **[averse to risk taking]**, but I'm very optimistic. I actually think that the academic library has the potential and has the necessary ingredients to be extremely successful in this environment **[perpective – future]**. We're scared to death of data curation **[major challenge]**. I know I don't know anything about data curation. I don't know what it's gonna take to do it. I know we gotta do it and I believe that if we put our mind to do it, we'll figure out how to do it.

Interviewer: Yeah, I'm optimistic also, I guess. It seems like there's so many possibilities out there and the bottom line, that's kind of why I'm interested in this notion of innovation is, it does seem like there's a lot of inertia, and so I'm hoping to just get a better understanding of what the sources of the inertia are and maybe ways to remove it.

Interviewer: Well, I'll bet you that at the ARL meeting today, that on the science librarianship in the future, that there are 150, 200 people. I mean I was there yesterday afternoon and it looked like about that many people, so a lot of folks are looking out there and seeing this.

[End of Audio]

Duration: 67 minutes