

Write Now! Managing Change and Increasing Research in an Academic Library

Catherine B. Soehner, Marie Paiva, Madison Donnelly

The preliminary results of this study were presented in May 2018 at the Utah Library Association Conference.

Abstract

New and innovative technologies have expanded librarian roles and expertise to include virtual learning, chat reference, online research guides, maker spaces, virtual reality, and more. Change is a consistent part of working in any library, and effectively managing change often has a learning curve for library administrators. Change Management theory is popular amongst business leaders, but could these theories work in libraries as well?

In 2017, Library Administration at Marriott Library designed a Change Management program based on the theories of Todd Jick, a nationally-recognized expert in organizational change management. Their goal was to increase the overall amount of scholarly research publications and creative products librarian faculty completed each year.

The authors conducted a multi-year research project, hypothesizing that by implementing Jick's framework, librarian faculty would create more scholarly work. Data was collected from faculty's self-reported research profiles, survey feedback from research retreats and workshops, and web traffic from staff intranet pages. An analysis of the results indicated a steady increase in research and scholarly output, and an overall positive response to the research change program.

Introduction

There is ongoing debate surrounding the advantages and disadvantages of faculty status for librarians in an academic institution.¹ Walters suggests, "active involvement in

¹ Alan Bernstein, "Academic Librarians and Faculty Status: Mountain, Molehill or Mesa," *Georgia Library Quarterly* 46, no. 2 (2009), <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/glq/vol46/iss2/6>; Mary Biggs, "Sources of Tension and Conflict between Librarians and Faculty," *The Journal of Higher Education* 52, no. 2 (1981), <https://doi.org/10.2307/1981090>; Jacalyn Bryan, "The Question of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians," *Library Review* 56, no. 9 (2007), <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530710831220>; Catherine Coker, Wyoma vanDuinkerken, and Stephen Bales, "Seeking Full Citizenship: A Defense of Tenure Faculty Status for Librarians," *College and Research Libraries* 71, no. 5 (2010),

scholarship can help improve librarians' subject knowledge, keep them engaged with the research literature, give them a better understanding of empirical research methods, and build professional affinity between librarians and regular faculty".² In their article weighing the pros and cons of faculty status, Gillum describes the opinion against faculty status for academic librarians as, "the belief that focus on status takes away from librarians' real mission of providing access to information; that the rigorous requirements necessary to obtain such status is not something that most librarians are prepared, or even qualified, to deal with; and that good librarians would be just as good without faculty status".³ Galbraith, Garrison, and Hales noticed that much of the arguments in this debate are simply opinions. In response, they surveyed librarians from Association of Research Libraries (ARL) institutions and captured attitudes for and against faculty status. The results "offer insight into the potential benefits and

<https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-54r1>; Blaise Cronin, "The Mother of All Myths," *Library Journal* 126, no. 3 (2001); Devin Feldman and Susan Sciammarella, "Both Sides of the Looking Glass: Librarian and Teaching Faculty Perceptions of Librarianship at Six Community Colleges," *College and Research Libraries* 61, no. 6 (2000), <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.61.6.491>; Janet Hill, "Constant Vigilance, Babelfish, and Foot Surgery: Perspectives on Faculty Status and Tenure for Academic Librarians," *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 5, no. 1 (2005), <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2005.0004>; Bruce R. Kingma and Gillian M. McCombs, "The Opportunity Costs of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians," *College and Research Libraries* 56, no. 3 (1995), https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_56_03_258; Wade R Kotter, "Bridging the great divide: Improving relations between librarians and classroom faculty," 25, no. 4 (1999), [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(99\)80030-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(99)80030-5); W. Bede Mitchell and Mary Reichel, "Publish or Perish: A Dilemma For Academic Librarians?," *College and Research Libraries* 60, no. 3 (1999), <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.60.3.232>; Dale S. Montanelli and Patricia F. Stenstrom, "The Benefits of Research for Academic Librarians and the Institutions They Serve," *College and Research Libraries* 47, no. 5 (1986), https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_47_05_482; Beth J. Shapiro, "The Way I See It: The Myths Surrounding Faculty Status for Librarians," *College and Research Libraries* 54, no. 10 (1993), <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.54.10.562>; Emily Werrell and Laura Sullivan, "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Review of the Literature," *College and Research Libraries* 48, no. 2 (1987), https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_48_02_95; Paul Alan Wyss, "Library School Faculty Member Perceptions Regarding Faculty Status for Academic Librarians," *College and Research Libraries* 71, no. 4 (2010), <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-53r1>.

² William H. Walters, "The Faculty Subculture, the Librarian Subculture, and Librarians' Scholarly Productivity," *Libraries and the Academy* 16, no. 4 (2016): 817, <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/632347>.

³ Shalu Gillum, "The True Benefit of Faculty Status for Academic Reference Librarians," *The Reference Librarian* 51, no. 4 (2010), <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2010.501419>.

disadvantages of faculty status in academic librarianship and suggest that faculty status improves relationships with teaching faculty, even if status alone cannot make them full peers".⁴ Gillum also brings up related points such as that librarians who do research makes them better at providing service to users and adds that some organizations offer feedback, support and mentoring mechanisms to faculty.⁵ Despite the intensity of this debate and the continual reflection on this issue, this topic continues to be argued with no agreement on the value of faculty status throughout the profession of academic librarians.

Background

At one academic library at a U.S. research institution, most librarians are hired as tenure-track faculty and have had some level of faculty status since 1971. However, the standards and criteria for research and the subsequent products of that research and creative activity, (such as publications and presentations) were not emphasized in earlier years and changed over time. As a result, most librarians working at the main library were hired as 'clinicians,' meaning employees whose main focus was on their librarianship duties including teaching, reference, developing collections, and providing research expertise to the campus.

Though conducting their own research was deemed optional, librarians were encouraged to be involved in the research process in some way. Therefore, many librarian faculty published, presented at conferences, developed creative works, and applied for grants. The library also offered additional funding for travel and in-house research grants. A series of open meetings called 'Grand Rounds' was established in earlier years to give an opportunity for librarian faculty to describe their research projects. Sometimes these presentations would be followed by a publication in some format. As a result of the former policy, there were an uneven number of publications, presentations, and creative works. It was simply up to the individual to pursue the Research and Creative Activity criteria.

In 2014, librarian faculty created a new set of Retention, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) criteria and processes for themselves based on a review of RPT criteria for other faculty on campus. Librarians voted on and accepted new criteria in January 2015 (and updated in February 2016) outlining clearer and more rigorous expectations for librarian faculty in the area

⁴ Quinn Galbraith, Melissa Garrison, and Whitney Hales, "Perceptions of Faculty Status among Academic Librarians," *College and Research Libraries* 77, no. 5 (2016), <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.77.5.582>.

⁵ Gillum, "The True Benefit of Faculty Status for Academic Reference Librarians," 325.

of Research & Creative Activity.⁶ Both of these were approved by campus faculty through a vote of the Academic Senate. While we embraced the new criteria, faculty under review in the following two years still had the option to use the previous RPT criteria. In this transition period, some faculty increased their research and others did not. By 2017, all librarians were required to use the new RPT criteria.

In early 2017, the library Dean met with the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA), to whom the Dean reported. After reviewing library faculty promotion and tenure packets, the SVPAA made it clear that more research products, such as outside grants, publications, and presentations, were expected from the library faculty to reflect the more rigorous RPT criteria. This was significant and new outside pressure requiring attention to changing both the culture and work priorities of library faculty.

Todd Jick's Recommendations for Managing Organizational Change

Library literature is rich with articles about change management, and more recently "change readiness."⁷ In addition to library literature, much can be learned from the disciplines of organizational psychology, systems thinking, and business about implementing successful change. One article from Todd Jick, a nationally recognized expert in change management, provided relevant advice. In his article, "Recipients of Change," Jick describes three recommendations for implementing change creating the least amount of upset, and the highest likelihood of reaching goals: 1) Simply Listening, 2) Delineating Expectations, and 3) Providing Support.⁸

Since these recommendations were grounded in theory, our research question was, if we implement these recommendations, what would be the result? We hypothesized that our faculty would increase the number of research products during the first year after implementing

⁶ J. Willard Marriott Library. "Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Career-line, Tenure-line, Tenured Marriott Library Faculty," (Manuscript, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2006), 10-11.

⁷ Steven Bell, "From Change Management to Change-Ready Leadership: Leading From the Library," *Library Journal* (2018), <https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=change-management-change-ready-leadership-leading-library>.

⁸ Todd D. Jick, "Recipients of Change," in *Organization Change: a Comprehensive Reader*, ed. W. Warner Burke, Dale G. Lake, and Jill Waymire Paine (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2008), 404-417.

Jick's recommendations and that an increase in research products would continue over a period of two more years.

Methods

Marriott Library administration followed Todd Jick's recommendations for organizational change over three years with the hypothesis that it would help our library transition to our new RPT Criteria's research emphasis.

1) Simply Listening

One-on-Ones and Focus Group Discussions

With our new focus on Research and Creative Activity, we decided to set aside a full day retreat for library faculty. In preparation for this retreat, the Associate Dean for Research and User Services (ADRUS) focused her attention on "Simply Listening." This included fourteen one-on-one conversations of non-judgmental listening with librarian faculty and two open forums to discuss the increased expectations and to hear recommendations for the full-day Research Retreat. These individual and small group conversations gave the ADRUS time to listen and the feedback generated led to the development of the agenda for the first Research Retreat.

Surveys

The ADRUS distributed a survey to all faculty librarians shortly after each Research Retreat as another listening method. All post-retreat surveys asked attendees if the retreat met stated objectives, to indicate the most and least productive part of the retreat, and to describe recommendations for change. The 2017 retreat survey asked additional questions to determine if librarians felt "heard" during the retreat's preparation. Additionally, the ADRUS distributed a survey prior to the 2018 Research Retreat to gauge librarian's needs.

As Research Workshops were held throughout each year, surveys were also distributed in December and May to determine if the workshops were useful during the previous 4-5 months. Again, the surveys became another method for listening without judgement as librarians described where the workshops fell short, where they were helpful, and what topics should be addressed in future classes.⁹

⁹ Jick, "The Recipients of Change." 414.

2) Delineating Expectations

Research Retreats

The library organized a Research Retreat each year in September from 2017-2019. The agenda for the 2017 Retreat's development is described above, and also included hiring a professional facilitator. The agenda for the 2018 Research Retreat was developed by requesting ideas, feedback, and recommendations for the retreat via a survey. A named facilitator recommended by the librarian faculty was hired to guide the group through the day. The agenda for the 2019 Retreat was developed by a small committee of faculty librarians who volunteered to develop and implement the retreat, and act as facilitators throughout the actual retreat day. One member of this committee held open forums to invite feedback on the objectives and content of the retreat.

Listening was a significant feature of the 2017 Retreat, with the morning sessions devoted to group feedback regarding the positive and negative aspects of increasing research and what barriers they expected to experience. While subsequent Retreats did not include this component, each Research Retreat provided opportunity for another of Jick's recommendations, to "Delineate Expectations" by reviewing the written criteria for Research & Creative Activity as described in *Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Career-line, Tenure-line, Tenured Marriott Library Faculty* (2016). We discussed the value and importance of research and creative activity and the subsequent output of that research including publishing, presenting, and grant writing, to name a few. It also provided an opportunity for faculty to connect with one another, learn about the research topics of their colleagues, consider new areas for their own research, find collaborators, and identify areas where they needed additional support.

Updating Job Descriptions

Expectations of librarians were further explored through the creation of job descriptions for every employee in the library. Librarian faculty were provided a template that structured their job descriptions based on the RPT criteria of librarianship/teaching, service, and research & creative activity. Allowing librarian faculty to create their own job descriptions gave them ownership of how the RPT criteria would be reflected in their official job descriptions.

3) Providing Support

From the 2017 Research Retreat and subsequent survey, three main areas were identified as barriers to increasing research activities: 1) Time, 2) Money, and 3) Skills Refresh. These obstacles provided the roadmap for Jick's recommendation to "Provide Support." In response, the ADRUS created three initial research support mechanisms to address the time and skills aspects of the described barriers, and utilized support systems already in place.

Fewer or No Reference Desk Hours for Librarians

Historically, the Knowledge Commons desk was staffed by a reference librarian who provided research assistance in addition to full and part-time staff who answered technology questions and checked out equipment. In July 2017, the library hired a full-time staff member to join two other library employees in covering the reference desk in place of librarian faculty. At that time it became optional to serve at the reference desk, and just five faculty librarians continued to rotate reference shifts along with staff.

No Online Chat by Librarians

Whereas librarians had previously covered most or all of the library's online chat hours, (usually averaging 8 hours per person per week,) in January 2018, online chat duties were reassigned to part-time library administration staff trained and supervised by the Dean's Executive Assistant. Chats often ended in referrals to the proper librarian or staff member if the part-time administration staff could not easily assist the patron. Additionally, online chat services were reduced due to a decline in use in recent years.

One Month with No (Non-Essential) Meetings

In the first year of our change management program, we eliminated all non-essential meetings in June (and in July of the following year) and Librarians were encouraged to conduct library business via email. This freed essential space in librarian's schedules to spend more time with their research ideas.

Research Time

Librarian faculty at Marriott Library are granted 21 days of annual paid leave, called Professional Development Time (PDT). Administration encouraged librarians, with advance approval, to plan and use their PDT to engage in research activities. Some faculty took leave of a few hours in one day and some for weeks at a time in order to work on their research pursuits.

Sabbaticals

After faculty are tenured, they can apply for sabbaticals which have to be approved a year in advance by the librarian's supervisor, Associate Dean, Dean, and the SVPAA. Sabbaticals can range from one month to a full year in duration.

Discretionary Funds

Funding was provided to each Associate Dean to use at their discretion to support faculty travel beyond the usual annual amount provided.

Internal Grants Funding

Library faculty and staff could apply for funding up to \$5,000 to conduct research. These funds could pay for a workshop, a unique survey instrument or software, statistical services, or travel to international conferences.

Weekly Writing Groups

First, two weekly writing groups were established on Monday mornings and during Wednesday's lunch hour. The groups were an hour long and began with a brief introduction in which each attendee described what research or creative project they planned to work on, followed by an hour of silent writing. Attendance on Monday mornings was low, but the Wednesday group had a consistent following of 5-6 regular visitors.

Staff Intranet

The Marriott Library created a new employee intranet site in 2016 that became the standard mechanism for sharing policies, procedures, meeting minutes, project management, and more. We used the intranet to provide resources and support for faculty engaged in research based on feedback from surveys and informal conversations. The home page was titled "Research & Creative Activity," and provided easy access to the criteria for faculty reviews along with lists of journal titles relevant to librarianship, research workshops announcements and notes, information about survey research and developing a research agenda to name just a few. It also included a list of librarianship journals with corresponding links to their individual "Instructions for Authors" sections, as well as a step-by-step guide to requesting an Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval of a research design. Faculty were invited to add their ideas to the list of resources, and soon librarians were sharing helpful guides about how to create a research

agenda, as well as mechanisms to help each other think and keep track of research in preparation for their Faculty Review. A screenshot of use statistics was taken periodically in January, May, and August of 2018 and January, May, and August of 2019 to measure the use of this resource.

Monthly Workshop Series

As another support mechanism, the ADRUS created a small team to recommend topics for a monthly workshop series focused on different aspects of expertise needed throughout a research project. Coincidentally, the university subscribed to the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD), providing all of campus with access to research and writing resources like webinars, mentors, and writing groups. NCFDD describes themselves as “an independent professional development, training, and mentoring community for faculty members, postdocs, and graduate students. We are 100% dedicated to supporting academics in making successful transitions throughout their careers.” The ADRUS scheduled workshops for faculty and showed pre-recorded webinars on topics like creating a semester plan for research and setting goals within a busy academic calendar. Additional in-person workshops brought in experts from around the university to address topics such as imposter syndrome and giving and receiving writing feedback. Attendance was recorded at all but one workshop, and surveys were sent out periodically to gauge their usefulness.

Works in Progress Series

As a result of feedback from our 2018 surveys, a Work in Progress (WiP) series was created. Each WiP event featured 1-4 librarian faculty or staff presenting research or creative activity currently in progress followed by questions or recommendations from colleagues. Faculty with projects in their early stages were especially encouraged to present when input would be most beneficial.

Results

We collected data for our project from four different sources: 1) Faculty Activity Reports, 2) Attendance at research retreats, 3) Surveys following research retreats, and 4) Staff intranet usage.

Faculty Activity Reports

Our first measure of analyzing our program's impact on scholarly output involved gathering and categorizing information contained in Faculty Activity Reports (FAR) from librarian's public Faculty Profile's on our University's website and directory. University of Marriott Library faculty are encouraged to list their research projects/creative works, research interests, CVs, and teaching experience in FAR and are asked to update it annually.

We collected and analyzed FAR data from each librarian listed on the annual faculty roster; starting in 2016, (the year before expectations changed and our program intervened) and ending in 2019. We verified and categorized all research citations reported in FAR for 2016-2019 in an Excel spreadsheet based on the definition in the *Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Career-line, Tenure-line, Tenured Marriott Library Faculty* (2016):

Candidates for retention, promotion, and tenure are expected to conduct research and produce scholarly publications or creative works that are presented or distributed publicly in appropriate venues—in print, online (including digital repositories), or face-to-face at conferences, meetings, exhibitions, and/or collections. In general, publication includes books, monographs, and/or bibliographies; professional articles and reviews in journals or blogs; scholarly book chapters; and formal presentations.

Research grants demonstrate excellence in research, but they are not a necessary component for library faculty since sustained effectiveness (rather than excellence) is required for an RPT decision. Where appropriate, the Faculty Review Committee will give positive consideration to the extent an individual has submitted grant applications and has been able to obtain research grant funds to support current and/or future research contributions.¹⁰

From this description and for the purposes of this study, "scholarly publications or creative works" were categorized as: Books, Book Chapters, Journal Articles, Blog Posts, Poster Presentations, Formal/Conference Presentations, Conference Proceedings, Submitted Grants, Funded Grants, and Creative Contributions. We categorized them in order to gather information on the number of scholarly works in broad categories.

¹⁰ J. Willard Marriott Library. "Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Career-line, Tenure-line, Tenured Marriott Library Faculty," (Manuscript, Salt Lake City, Utah, 2006), 10.

Data was retrieved from FAR for each faculty librarian regarding their reported research productivity. Though data is limited in that it is self-reported, we gained a good sense that overall research output was increasing (see Table 1)

	2016	2017	2018	2019
# of Librarian Faculty Members	43	40	43	45
Cumulative Research Products	105	124	173	162
<i>Books</i>	0	4	4	6
<i>Book Chapters</i>	4	3	2	3
<i>Journal Articles</i>	12	23	17	17
<i>Blog Posts</i>	4	1	14	7
<i>Poster Presentations</i>	5	11	19	8
<i>Formal/Conference Presentations</i>	63	62	87	92
<i>Conference Proceedings</i>	4	5	4	2
<i>Submitted Grants</i>	0	0	0	1
<i>Funded Grants</i>	5	3	9	4
<i>Creative Contributions</i>	8	12	17	22

Table 1. Research products produced yearly by faculty at Marriott Library from 2016 – 2019.

Research Retreat Attendance

We also quantified our change management program’s impact by counting the number of people in the room at the beginning of each Research Retreat and administering feedback surveys. Table 2 provides the number of attendees at each of the Faculty Research Retreats held in 2017, 2018, and 2019. Due to teaching or other conflicts, some librarians attended the retreat for a half-day session.

	2017 Retreat	2018 Retreat	2019 Retreat
<i>Librarian Faculty in Attendance</i>	37 of 40	39 of 45	29 of 45

Table 2. Faculty Research Retreat attendance from 2017 – 2019.

Research Retreat Surveys

After each retreat, the ADRUS distributed a survey link to attendees soliciting feedback on both the Research Retreat and our overall change management program via Survey Monkey, a free online survey tool. Our survey analyst then coded and analyzed the results in the qualitative data analysis program, Atlas.ti. Atlas.ti is a robust program that we used to code

and annotate our survey responses, identify important themes in our surveys, and visualize our data. This analysis helped us to improve our retreats and change management program each year and to assess whether Todd Jick's recommendations were easing our library's transition.

Surveys

2017 Research Retreat Feedback Survey

In 2017, 22/37 faculty attendees responded to our Research Retreat Survey. Our survey analyst coded 68 comments as "positive" and 28 comments as "negative". Of the 11/22 respondents who reported meeting one-on-one with the ADRUS in preparation for the retreat, we asked "were your ideas added to the retreat agenda?" This was to assess our efforts to listen non-judgmentally and incorporate librarian's ideas in the change process. Out of 11 respondents, 10 said "yes, all" or "yes, some". 11 of 11 respondents reported that they felt heard even if their ideas were not added to the agenda or process.

Eleven comments expressed that dedicated time to connect with colleagues about research was helpful. One librarian remarked, "One of the biggest benefits was time with my colleagues away from the library to connect and discuss potential collaboration." Another commented, "Generally, I am more impressed by [Marriott Library's faculty]. I am interested in others' work and others are interested in my work. We are supporting one another." Additionally, 19/22 respondents described the retreat's "Group discussion on research challenges and overcoming them," as either 'somewhat' or 'very helpful'. Across 7 individual write-in responses, librarians expressed they felt more comfortable moving forward with their research project after the retreat. For instance, "[My takeaway is] recognizing that other librarians came into the profession with a focus on service, not research, too," and "there are several other faculty with research interests related to my own, so we could support one another and create a larger project rather than working solo." Another librarian commented, "I need to look for opportunities for collaboration and stop doubting myself."

One question asked respondents to rate how much they agree or disagree with the statement, "I understand the expectations our Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs has for all faculty members." Three librarians responded that they 'somewhat disagreed' and 13 more said they only 'somewhat agreed' with this statement. One person commented, "Faculty are interested and committed to research but may be somewhat unsure what is expected of them." This was important feedback for us in order to clarify research expectations more carefully to faculty moving forward.

Dedicated research time was frequently identified as a major barrier to faculty research. One comment remarked, “The retreat was exceedingly helpful in moving toward the above stated goals. I’m hopeful that library administration and individual departments/divisions can work together to adjust workflow and expectations in other areas in order to make research time a priority.” One librarian described one of their takeaways as “A shared awareness that research time needs to be carved out as an organization.” Another said, “We need to reorient our time and expectations to accommodate new expectations.” Another commenter listed their three takeaways as, “Research is a priority for tenure-line librarians at the Marriott Library, we are supported by library administration to make research a priority in our daily work, a sense of excitement about committing to producing research as a faculty.” For improvements, one librarian suggested we create, “time for reporting faculty to work with Associate Dean/supervisors to discuss strategic planning to balance teaching/librarianship workload with research expectations and begin to carve out time for research as a department.” Among ‘suggested next steps’ a respondent said, “More travel funding, more creative ways of freeing up time for research for all faculty.” Another said, “Clearing the table and making space for Librarian research feels like an important next step. What systemic change needs to happen, and is it possible?”

Thirteen comments asked for more support in the form of workshops on how to get published and IRB approval, in addition to requests for consistent follow-ups and work-in progress reviews to support faculty in increasing their scholarly output. Other changes we made in subsequent retreats based on survey feedback included scrapping an unpopular “Mind Map” exercise and implementing assigned seating to diversify the groups of librarians.

2018 Research Retreat Needs Survey

In line with our efforts to listen, The ADRUS distributed an online survey prior to the second Research Retreat in 2018, hoping to identify specific needs and topics to be addressed at the upcoming Retreat. Twenty-nine librarians responded to this survey.

When asked, “At the end of the [2018] Faculty Retreat, I would like to be able to, (Select all that apply)”, 16 librarians answered “Develop support mechanisms for my research in order to make progress on my research goals. For example, create a research interest group, a supportive community of writers, a plan for accomplishing research goals, and/or a 3-5 year research agenda.” Sixteen also selected they would like to, “Name some of the research projects my colleagues are engaged in to get a better understanding of the types of research being conducted, identify other faculty with similar research interests, and possibly invite others

to join my project.” The third most selected survey answer for this question with 15 selections was “Make progress on some aspect of my research in order to see immediate results.”

One notable write-in answer asked for clarification on creative works, “I would like advice for those of us working primarily in non-textual fields as to what counts as research.” This clarification was important and specific to our library because of our extensive Book Arts program and its pertaining faculty. Not all of our faculty members were bound to the same kind of research, and part of our challenge was clarifying what kind of research fits under diverse disciplines. It was clear we needed to broaden what librarian’s saw as ‘research’.

When asked what activities they would like to engage with at the research retreat, 16 selected, “Create a plan for accomplishing my research goals. This is usually a one-semester or one-year plan.” 11 selected they would like to “Develop a 3-year or 5-year research agenda” during the retreat, and 11 more selected “Create a sabbatical proposal as part of an overall research agenda.” One librarian remarked, “I’d like to stress the importance of providing a structured time for divisions to meet and identify and develop structures, practices, and schedules that support faculty research. I firmly believe that reprioritizing research requires departmental/division-level vision and support.” This pointed to several ways to support faculty in their research, namely through strategic planning, time, and time management.

2018 Research Retreat Feedback Survey

After the 2018 Research Retreat, 18/39 attendees completed our feedback survey. The previous year, respondents remarked that our survey was too long at seventeen questions, so we shortened this year’s survey to nine. Consequently, there was less data to code and analyze. Our survey analyst coded 9 comments as positive, and 5 as negative.

We received positive feedback to assigned seating at this year’s retreat, and again, librarians reported that spending time with faculty outside of the library was beneficial. “It gave me the opportunity to sit with people I didn’t know well and have some interesting discussions.” Thirteen ‘somewhat’ or ‘completely agreed’ with the statement, “I had an opportunity to identify other faculty with similar research interests,” and six respondents said they somewhat or completely agreed with the statement, “I had an opportunity to invite others to join my project.” Furthermore, 16/18 respondents remarked that “Faculty Research Reviews” where faculty voluntarily presented their current research in progress were helpful. Two comments asked for another workshop on constructing a Research Statement, and three requested consistent follow ups on research throughout the year in the form of “work sessions” and “more frequent research presentations/pitches.” This, along with many suggestions for work-in-progress research

presentations interspersed throughout the year sparked our 'Works in Progress' Series beginning in Fall 2018.

Several comments indicated that librarians felt less anxious about research in general. "[I'm] motivated to follow up with finding and experimenting with more structured support mechanisms to further my research." Another said, "the facilitator made it seem less intense." This year's facilitator was a former faculty member of the library, whom some had worked with previously and some had not. Four comments expressed that although the facilitator was effective, they would prefer someone unaffiliated with the library altogether. Along with intensity, addressing the anxiety surrounding the ambiguity of research and clarifying its definition at this retreat was crucial. Five librarians reported that the Research Retreat expanded their definition of research, indicating decreased fear/anxiety about research expectations. Three listed a takeaway from the retreat as, "research can take many forms and sizes," "research includes a diversity of topics," and "expanded understanding of how research is defined". One empowered commenter remarked, "Motivated to follow up with finding and experimenting with more structured support mechanisms to further my research."

13/18 respondents somewhat or completely agreed with the statement, "I made progress on some aspect of my research", and 10/17 somewhat or completely agreed with, "I was able to develop support mechanisms for my research in order to make progress on my research goals." However, one comment still expressed confusion about research expectations, "[Library Dean] has still yet to make clear how much of our time is to be spent on research, there is no clear answer." Some asked for more structure to keep themselves accountable, "I would love to see a faculty retreat especially focused on strategic planning and outlining activities week by week toward a specific goal."

In response to librarian's requests for practical research time during the retreat, this year's retreat allotted a half day for 'Time to work on your research.' However, this solicited polarizing opinions. When asked how helpful "Time to work on your research" was, nine librarians responded neutrally or that it was somewhat or not at all helpful, while another 8 labeled the time as 'Very helpful'. One commenter remarked, "I honestly felt the day could've been a half-day retreat. It seemed like a lot of people left at (or after?) the co-current sessions because they didn't want to stay for the "work on your research" session." Another said, "I think we could just eliminate the time to work on our own research. But I would like a follow up session dedicated to hands-on work on our research agenda and/or strategic planning." In regard to research time, one librarian said, "Need more time to write and publish. PDT isn't

enough.” This indicated to us that our support systems were helping some librarians, and not others, but still a great barrier to all was time.

2019 Research Retreat Feedback Survey

In 2019, 26/39 attendees responded to our Research Retreat survey. Our survey analyst coded 22 comments as positive and 14 as negative. Nineteen respondents somewhat or completely agreed that the objectives, “I can articulate my research identity and explain how it affects my librarianship,” and “I have identified obstacles I face in realizing my research identity,” were met. However, just nine respondents somewhat or completely agreed with the statement “I left the retreat with one or two ideas for projects I am passionate about, a timeline, and a support system of colleagues who can help me reach my goals.” One commenter remarked, “being directed to boil down and articulate my research agenda was a very helpful exercise for me.”

Like previous years, seven comments expressed that networking with other librarians was a positive aspect of the Research Retreat. This year we invited librarians from our campus’s medical library. “The thing I actually found most helpful from the retreat was in just making connections with people I don’t work with often (such as [the Eccles Health Sciences Library Faculty]). Librarians at the [University of Utah] tend to get soloed but then don’t participate in activities to change that.”

Several comments alluded to an issue from the 2019 retreat... inattentiveness. “This Retreat did not feel like people were removing themselves from their daily work and other distractions in order to focus on the topic(s) at hand. Instead, it felt like most people were trying to still get their work done (answering emails, etc.) during the Retreat.” Another said, “I was at the Retreat AND ALSO trying to maintain my usual level of engagement and responsiveness to patrons across campus.”

While librarians reported struggling with managing their workload to remain present, 6 comments still identified “time” as the largest barrier to research for library faculty. One comment said, “I would value having built in moments to make specific goals and take conscious steps toward my research practice. It’s so challenging during ordinary office hours.” Another said, “While I thought the panels and other discussions were excellent, I found that I didn’t make tangible progress toward my own work or semester plan with this year’s agenda. Since my main constraint is time to devote to research projects, I’ve appreciated the format of earlier retreats which built in sessions for developing research planning. As good as the conversation was, I think I would prioritize more practical moments built into the day.” When

asked about follow-up workshops, conversations and next steps, four librarians cited the *Works in Progress* series as something that has been consistently helpful but underattended. While four respondents requested more follow-up workshops, six suggested the Retreat be reduced to a half day, one suggested the Retreat be held every other year, and six more asked for the retreat to be replaced with a free day for research. One librarian commented, “For my own personal research interests, I would benefit much more from a day free of interruptions to do my work.” and, “Honestly, give us a day where we’re not expected to answer calls or emails and just let us write.” “I don’t need follow up workshops, conversations or next steps. What I need is time to do the research.”

Staff Intranet Usage

Screenshots showing the usage of research information pages were taken in January, May, and August 2018, and January, May, and August 2019. Usage statistics of each page were added up to determine the total amount of use for each year and to calculate the pages with the highest use. The most heavily referenced resources included pages entitled ‘2018 Faculty Retreat’, ‘Workshops 2017-2018’, ‘Journals - Call for Proposals’, and ‘Survey Research - IRB Application.’ The page titled, Journals - Call for Proposals, provided a list of library-focused journals with corresponding links to the journal’s instructions for authors. As feedback came in from the first Research Retreat, a notable request was for information on completing paperwork for IRB approvals or exemptions. Once created, this resource was used regularly throughout the year following the request.

Limitations

There are a number of limitations to this study based on the use of a self-reporting system and the fluctuation of faculty throughout a year. As mentioned above, FAR is a self-reporting system whose accuracy is dependent upon each faculty member correctly entering their research citations into their Faculty Profile in a timely manner. If a librarian did not enter information about their research products into FAR, the research products were not counted in this study. Each faculty member’s research products were recorded exactly as the person entered it. No assumptions or corrections were made regarding the data, meaning that if a faculty member noted they submitted a grant, there was no assumption that the grant was funded unless the person also supplied the funded grant information. The same method was applied when a faculty member gave a presentation at a conference and then submitted a written version of that presentation for a conference proceeding. If the faculty member listed

both the presentation and the proceeding, then both items were counted as research products for that librarian. When two or more faculty authored one research product, the item was counted whenever a faculty member included it in their FAR, meaning that one article would be counted when Author 1 from the Marriott Library listed it and again when Author 2 from the Marriott Library listed the same article.

Once a faculty member leaves the university, their FAR account is immediately removed, which proved problematic for gathering data from 2016. For example, several faculty departed in 2016, and since data collection began in 2017, we were unable to retrieve any research data from those faculty who left, even though they were counted as official members of the library faculty for 2016. The list of librarian faculty at the Marriott Library is set in March each year in preparation for the upcoming RPT process, which begins on April 1. We used the official faculty roster for each year to determine the faculty whose research and creative works were included in this study, even if departures or hires took place throughout the year.

Discussion

The results of this study show an increase of scholarly output and research among librarian faculty from 2016 to 2018, with a dip in 2019. Of particular note were the increases seen in the number of Books (0 in 2016, 6 in 2019), Formal/Conference Presentations (63 in 2016, 92 in 2019), and Creative Contributions (8 in 2016, 22 in 2019). Journal Articles remained steady with 12 articles published in 2016 and 17 in 2019 with a small surge to 23 in 2017. A similar surge in 2018 was seen in a number of categories including Poster Presentations, Funded Grants, and Blog Posts.

Though overall research products increased from 105 in 2016 to 162 in 2019, the number was slightly greater in 2018 at 173. One cause of the decrease of documented research in 2019 included the departure of two librarians who were regular creators of research products. As a result, we could not access their FARs in 2020 to record the research products they created in 2019, however we used the official faculty roster for our data and listed them as faculty members without any research products for 2019. The 2019 decrease could also be attributed to other factors, including research fatigue and the often long and cumbersome cycle of research from idea to finished product. For instance, many faculty give conference presentations as preparation for writing a journal article, and we saw 'Conference/Formal Presentations' increase from 87 in 2018, to 92 in 2019. Further research of 2020s research output, specifically of journal articles, could tell us if our hypothesis about the research cycle is correct.

We attempted to measure our efforts to listen non-judgmentally in our 2017 Research Retreat Survey, and throughout the program identified and attempted to address the three largest barriers to time, money, and skills refresh. However, 2019's notable dip in workshop attendance and answers from our 2019 Research Retreat survey revealed that despite our efforts to address all three of faculty's identified needs, 'skills refresh' seemed to be the only one addressed to such a point where faculty stopped engaging in extracurricular workshops, and instead asked for more time. In fact, thirteen comments in our 2019 survey specifically requested for the Research Retreat to be reduced to a half day, eliminated altogether, or replaced with a free day for research. This was an indication to us that our efforts to help refresh faculty's research skills were successful for many librarians, though four 2019 survey respondents still requested follow-up workshops indicating some gap in research skill and confidence.

Furthermore, throughout our study we found that offering support such as workshops, informational web pages, and retreats, did not mean that people took advantage of these and that even if they did use the support offered, it did not necessarily correlate to an increased number of research products. For instance, the Works in Progress Series was consistently praised in surveys but frequently mourned as underattended. One librarian remarked, "I really enjoy the Works in Progress Series and hope it gets more traction," and another said, "continue the work in progress series and try and up participation." Other comments were, "I think we have to start having conversations with the librarian faculty here about engagement," and, "we can plan workshops all day long but if no one comes then our time is wasted." However, a pattern emerged of increased faculty attendance at workshops if the workshops were added to their electronic calendars by an administrative assistant. Once placed in librarian's electronic calendars, the date and time were blocked out and attendance increased. If there was an expectation that faculty would add each workshop to their own calendars, attendance decreased, even with regular reminders of the upcoming workshops.

Though money was listed as a major barrier to conducting and producing research, survey results suggested that while more money was always welcome, it was significantly less of a concern from 2017 to 2019. Administration encouraged faculty to use the benefits of sabbaticals and Professional Development Time (a separate, additional paid leave specifically to allow time for research), but survey results still indicated that faculty were struggling to find time to devote to research and writing. Time to devote to research was the main barrier still commented on, noted, and referenced in surveys.

Future Research

A number of areas require additional investigation, but we hypothesize that it would be beneficial to implement a similarly-structured change management program at a similarly-sized academic library. Conducting a comparable program with the goal of increasing research production may provide additional evidence supporting or not supporting Todd Jick's recommendations as a scaffolding for change.

Considering the emphasis on "Time" as the main barrier to research production, adding questions to the surveys about the number of hours per week or month spent on research activities could prove an interesting measure of faculty perception of the amount of time they actually spend on research. From our own observations and faculty suggestions, we recommend using scales in yearly surveys to gauge each faculty's level of confidence toward conducting research/feelings of imposter syndrome, and the usefulness of each retreat, as well as questions about what type of support is desired.

Conclusion

During the time library administration implemented Todd Jick's recommendations for organizational change, (non-judgmental listening, delineating expectations, and providing support)¹¹ there were an increased number of research products created by librarians at the Marriott Library. While no causation can be claimed, Jick's practical steps for change management proved a useful plan for implementing a significant change in research emphasis and expectations among librarians, as well as their subsequent creation of research and creative products.

It became clear that non-judgmental listening was a key component to determining the types of support we provided to our faculty. As each year progressed, feedback received through the surveys gave direction to mechanisms of support that were implemented. For example, initial research workshops focused on skills building while in subsequent years, workshops changed focus to providing short research presentations from library faculty and campus faculty. Weekly writing groups were initially well attended, but over time, these writing groups diminished in attendance. Support around finding more time and money for faculty research remained the same throughout the study. This type of support involved hiring staff to work the reference desk and chat reference shifts so that faculty no longer needed to spend

¹¹ Jick, "The Recipients of Change." 414.

their time on these services, allowing for a full month of no meetings, encouraging the use of sabbaticals, implementing an internal grant opportunity, and providing supplemental funds for research. Listening carefully to what faculty needed to support their research, writing, presenting, and other creative activity became an important aspect of their success.

Using Jick's recommendations as a scaffold for change in another academic library would provide an interesting comparison as would using Jick's recommendations for another aspect of change within the Marriott Library. The comparisons would provide information about using Jick's recommendations as a consistent change management tool in academic libraries.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to thank the faculty at the J. Willard Marriott Library for answering surveys and participating in workshops and retreats.

Bibliography

- Bell, Steven. "From Change Management to Change-Ready Leadership: Leading from the Library." *Library Journal* (2018). <https://www.libraryjournal.com/?detailStory=change-management-change-ready-leadership-leading-library>.
- Bernstein, Alan. "Academic Librarians and Faculty Status: Mountain, Molehill or Mesa." *Georgia Library Quarterly* 46, no. 2 (2009): 1-4. <https://digitalcommons.kennesaw.edu/glq/vol46/iss2/6>.
- Biggs, Mary. "Sources of Tension and Conflict between Librarians and Faculty." *The Journal of Higher Education* 52, no. 2 (1981): 182-201. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1981090>.
- Bryan, Jacalyn. "The Question of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians." *Library Review* 56, no. 9 (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1108/00242530710831220>.
- Coker, Catherine, Wyoma vanDuinkerken, and Stephen Bales. "Seeking Full Citizenship: A Defense of Tenure Faculty Status for Librarians." *College and Research Libraries* 71, no. 5 (2010): 406-17. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-54r1>.
- Cronin, Blaise. "The Mother of All Myths." *Library Journal* 126, no. 3 (2001): 144.
- Feldman, Devin, and Susan Sciammarella. "Both Sides of the Looking Glass: Librarian and Teaching Faculty Perceptions of Librarianship at Six Community Colleges." *College and Research Libraries* 61, no. 6 (2000): 491-98. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.61.6.491>.
- Galbraith, Quinn, Melissa Garrison, and Whitney Hales. "Perceptions of Faculty Status among Academic Librarians." *College and Research Libraries* 77, no. 5 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.77.5.582>.
- Gillum, Shalu. "The True Benefit of Faculty Status for Academic Reference Librarians." *The Reference Librarian* 51, no. 4 (2010): 321-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2010.501419>.
- Hill, Janet. "Constant Vigilance, Babelfish, and Foot Surgery: Perspectives on Faculty Status and Tenure for Academic Librarians." *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 5, no. 1 (2005): 7-22. <https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2005.0004>.
- J. Willard Marriott Library. "Criteria, Standards, and Procedures for Career-Line, Tenure-Line, Tenured Marriott Library Faculty." (2016). Manuscript, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Jick, Todd D. "Recipients of Change," in *Organization Change: a Comprehensive Reader*, ed. W. Warner Burke, Dale G. Lake, and Jill Waymire Paine (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2008), 404-417.

- Kingma, Bruce R., and Gillian M. McCombs. "The Opportunity Costs of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians." *College and Research Libraries* 56, no. 3 (1995): 258-64. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_56_03_258.
- Kotter, Wade R. "Bridging the Great Divide: Improving Relations between Librarians and Classroom Faculty." 25, no. 4 (1999): 294. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333\(99\)80030-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0099-1333(99)80030-5).
- Mitchell, W. Bede, and Mary Reichel. "Publish or Perish: A Dilemma for Academic Librarians?." *College and Research Libraries* 60, no. 3 (1999). <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.60.3.232>.
- Montanelli, Dale S., and Patricia F. Stenstrom. "The Benefits of Research for Academic Librarians and the Institutions They Serve." *College and Research Libraries* 47, no. 5 (1986): 4. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_47_05_482.
- Shapiro, Beth J. "The Way I See It: The Myths Surrounding Faculty Status for Librarians." *College and Research Libraries* 54, no. 10 (1993): 562-65. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crln.54.10.562>.
- Walters, William H. "The Faculty Subculture, the Librarian Subculture, and Librarians' Scholarly Productivity." *Libraries and the Academy* 16, no. 4 (2016): 817-43. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/632347>.
- Werrell, Emily, and Laura Sullivan. "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Review of the Literature." *College and Research Libraries* 48, no. 2 (1987). https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_48_02_95.
- Wyss, Paul Alan. "Library School Faculty Member Perceptions Regarding Faculty Status for Academic Librarians." *College and Research Libraries* 71, no. 4 (2010): 15. <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-53r1>.

Catherine B Soehner (catherine.soehner@utah.edu) is Associate Dean for Research and Director, Spencer S. Eccles Health Sciences Library at the University of Utah.

Marie Paiva (marie.paiva@utah.edu) is Librarian, Research and User Services, J. Willard Marriott Library at the University of Utah.

Madison Donnelly (madisondonnelly1@gmail.com) is a Research Consultant and MFA Candidate at the Yale School of Art.

Published: November 2021