Publications

2015

Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians

Anne Marie Casey
Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University, caseya3@erau.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://commons.erau.edu/publication

Part of the Library and Information Science Commons

Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians

Anne Marie Casey

The Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians (LIAL), which offered its first institute in 1999, is a collaboration of the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) and the Harvard Institutes for Higher Education at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.[1] Intended to provide participants with the tools and insight needed to improve effectiveness and respond rapidly to a changing environment, LIAL is held each year for one week in August on the campus of Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts.[2]

The need for leadership programs for librarians was recognized by John Collins, a librarian at Harvard University, who had lobbied for several years for an institute for librarians similar to those the university held for other academic administrators. In 1998, Harvard University invited ACRL to join with them in planning a leadership institute for academic librarians. The president of ACRL at the time, Maureen Sullivan, brought the proposal to the ACRL Board of Directors, which approved it. Sullivan shared in the initial curriculum development and has been a member of the LIAL faculty since the second institute in 2000.[3]

Academic library directors and assistant directors were the original target audience.[4] By 2013, the positions of those encouraged to apply had broadened to include college and university librarians with leadership and/or management responsibilities; library deans, directors, and those reporting to them in associate or assistant positions; and other campus administrators with responsibilities that routinely affect important library-related functions.[5] Typical cohorts come from all types and sizes of academic library organizations and generally number close to 100.

Curriculum

Participants are led in case-method discussions on a daily basis for a week in the summer by professors who are experts in various areas of leadership.[6] The textbook and background reading focus prominently on the concept of the four frames approach to leadership, first advanced by Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal in 1984 and later applied to academic leadership by Bolman and Joan V. Gallos.[7] The curriculum consists of lectures on leadership, particularly the four frames approach; case study discussions; and small group work. Each participant reads and discusses four to five case studies on leadership issues during the week and prepares in advance a mini-case related to an actual workplace issue, which he or she presents in a small group setting for peer feedback.[8] The program objectives focus on two key questions: How well positioned are the participants' organizations to meet current and future challenges, and how effective is the leadership of each participant?[9]

Joseph (Joe) Zolner, the senior director of the Harvard Institutes for Higher Education, has directed LIAL since the fourth institute in 2002. In a telephone conversation with me, Zolner stated that he audits the institute experience on a daily basis to ensure that the faculty are successful in fostering two types of learning: informational and transformational. Basing the instruction on the work of adult learning researcher and author Bob Kegan, a Harvard faculty member who taught in the LIAL program for several years, Zolner leads the faculty in a variety of techniques aimed at instilling both types of learning.[10]

In his description of informational learning, Zolner uses a metaphor of the mind as an open vessel that faculty and participants attempt to fill with new information. The LIAL faculty use lecture, assigned reading, and discussions to achieve informational learning. The aim of the program's informational portions is to make the unfamiliar more familiar.

Transformational learning, on the other hand, seeks to make the familiar less familiar in the interest of expanding a student's intellectual horizons. In this case, the metaphorical vessel of the mind changes shape and may be equipped to absorb more informational learning. The purpose of this method is to change the way a person actually thinks in order to open his or her mind up to absorb more information and consider different approaches to leadership. One of the exercises focusing on transformational learning helps identify for participants the incidents in their lives that may have contributed to an immunity to change.[11] Led through a series of steps related to a behavior they want to change helps the participants to recognize what lies at the root of their inability to make the desired change. This process often results in a deeper understanding of one's own thoughts and motivations and allows participants to move past an issue and develop new behaviors or practices.

Zolner emphasizes the importance of active engagement for adults to learn. He and the other faculty provide multiple ways for LIAL participants to engage with the concepts and with other participants. One example is the mini-case each participant is asked to share in an assigned small group. This pre-institute assignment, in which participants write a brief case describing a workplace challenge, allows them through the small group discussion to apply the techniques learned in the program to a real life situation. The discussion of the cases occurs in a daily session where group members help each other reflect the challenges from different perspectives and often suggest ways to resolve issues.

Leadership Approach

The leadership approach on which LIAL bases its instruction is Bolman and Deal's four frames approach to leadership.[12] Developed further in subsequent publications, this approach invites leaders to view their work through four different perspectives or frames, which provide

them with a map to navigate through circumstances.[13] "A frame is a mental model—a set of ideas and assumptions—that you carry in your head to help you understand a particular territory. A good frame makes it easier to know what you are up against and, ultimately, what you can do about it."[14]

Bolman and Deal studied leadership theory and reviewed the many ideas about the ways in which organizations work. From this research they consolidated the major schools of organizational thought into "a comprehensive framework encompassing four perspectives."[15] Their goal was to provide a useable approach that enabled leaders to view a situation through one of four distinct frames: structural, human resources, political, and symbolic.[16]

Zolner states that the four frames set up the circumstances for transformational learning. Asking participants to look at the different ways they could respond to a situation, depending on the frame they view it through, encourages them to broaden their perspectives. Zolner believes that leaders who take a multifaceted approach to the issues that confront them are better at what they do than those who tackle issues in the same way all the time. He appreciates the four frames approach particularly because it encourages people to understand the context of their organizations, and he states, "Context matters!" He adds that the frames give leaders a roadmap that helps them take care of a situation within the context of the organization.

Literature Review

For several years, one or two LIAL alumni wrote synopses of their cohort experiences, most of which were published in *College & Research Libraries News*. These testimonials described themes from the curriculum, experiences, and faculty who taught that particular year in the Institute. They extolled the benefits of interactive learning and the positive difference the

program made in their lives as well their enjoyment of the institute, which Larry Hardesty

summed up as, "We worked hard and we had fun." [17]

While similar in their descriptions of the institutes, each alum focused on a different

strength or experience of the program. Laverna Saunders wrote about the first program, which

took place in the summer of 1999.[18] Her article contained a brief history, details of the format,

and information on the faculty. One facet she emphasized was that the ground rules empowered

both the introverts and the extroverts to participate. Three other alumni of the first institute,

David Bilyeau, Marianne Gaunt, and Maryruth Glogowski, authored an article that focused on

the particular takeaways they experienced. These included increasing the use of the four frames

approach to leadership challenges, creating opportunities to think, and learning to pay attention

to the context.[19]

Hardesty's report on the second institute in 2000 focused on the strengths of the faculty

and the goal each participant left with: to do something different based on what they had

learned.[20] Linda Marie Golian and Rebecca Donlan, who wrote about their experiences in 2001,

the third year, discussed the shift in perspective that many participants observed.[21] The

description of the fourth institute in 2002 highlighted the amount of time the planners built in for

socialization and disengagement from the world of work and home.[22] The account that Ed Garten

wrote about the fifth program in 2003 brings out the fact that peer-to-peer learning is as valuable

as the curriculum.[23]

Two articles explored year six. Linda Masselink and Kelly Jacobsma described the

program in 2004 with particular emphasis on the value of the case study method, especially the

library case discussion led by Maureen Sullivan.[24] Another 2004 alumna, Sally Kalin, wrote an

article several years after her experience in which she described the program, faculty, and

readings in detail. She also stated that LIAL was the best leadership program she had experienced.[25] The final summary covered the seventh institute in 2005. Deborah B. Dancik wrote glowingly about the important contributions her colleagues made to build a collective understanding of leadership and the importance of their continued connection after they all went home.[26]

The Four Frames Approach to Leadership in Libraries

A substantial amount of research has been conducted on the four frames approach to leadership since Bolman and Deal first published in 1984.[27] A number of them are highlighted by Bolman on his website.[28] Few publications, however, deal with this approach in libraries. Among them is the dissertation research conducted by Zhixian Yi, in which he explored how academic library directors deal with change based on the guidelines of Bolman and Deal.[29] Subsequent articles based on the research of Bolman and Deal explored the ways directors conduct meetings and set goals.[30] Other dissertation research includes that of Vinaya L. Tripuraneni, who used Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientations instrument to investigate the leadership approach considered ideal for academic library leaders by their colleagues.[31]

A small number of additional publications reference the four frames approach as applied to libraries. Irene M.H. Herold, in her dissertation study of the College Library Directors' Mentor Program, suggests that the concept may provide a basis for a reenvisioned version of the program.[32] Felix T. Chu explores the idea of approaching a reference encounter through the lenses of the four frames, while Mott Linn urges new library leaders to embrace this approach as they are learning about their organizations.[33]

<div align="center">

My Experience

</div>

I attended the Harvard LIAL program in 2012. Much of the weeklong session was interesting. Various lectures and specific discussions in the small groups and the larger setting built on leadership principles I had learned in my doctoral program (managerial leadership in the information professions at Simmons College in Boston, Massachusetts) and in workshops at library conferences. After completing the program, I read books and articles recommended by faculty and fellow participants, which contributed to enhancing my communication style.

Two sessions, in particular, resonated very strongly with me. The first was the immunity to change exercise presented by Lisa Lahey. At the beginning of the session, she asked us to partner up with one student and write down a behavior we wished to change. I decided to explore my hesitation to attend social gatherings at work and, when forced to participate, my tendency to socialize only with the secretaries. During this exercise, I investigated the foundation of my discomfort with operating in the political frame, particularly networking and building alliances with the upper levels of the university organization, and discovered the underlying beliefs that often held me back. Related to my upbringing, the root cause had nothing to do with my abilities, but with beliefs and assumptions I had carried from childhood. Realizing this freed me to feel more comfortable in political situations.

The other session that was very helpful to me was the discussion of my mini-case in the small group setting. It dealt with an issue that kept recurring in some interactions with supervisors and subordinates in the three years I had held my position as a library director. After describing it to my small group colleagues, I was surprised to receive meaningful feedback immediately. Through their guidance, I discovered that I had been trying to impose the collaborative, shared governance culture of my former institution on my current workplace,

which is hierarchical. Realizing this has helped me to work more effectively within the context of my organization and to stop trying to transform it into the culture I was used to.

The Four Frames Approach to Leadership

Much of the LIAL program focuses on the four frames approach to academic leadership. In 2012, Bolman was a primary lecturer and discussion leader.[34] While all the frames were covered, the faculty continuously drew our attention to the importance of the political frame. They pointed out that this is the view most often missed by those who do not succeed in leadership positions. One particular lecture included a video demonstrating Ronald Reagan's ability to operate in the political frame and Jimmy Carter's seeming dismissal of the importance of building political alliances. After viewing the clip, we discussed the relative success of both presidents and how much depended on one's ability and the other's ignorance of the importance of political alliances. I realized that I avoided working in the political frame wherever I could and saw myself in the depiction of Jimmy Carter. This caused me to reflect on the fact that my behavior was probably detrimental to my effectiveness as a leader, just as his appeared to be.

Of the four frames, structural, human resources, political, and symbolic, my natural tendency had been to rely heavily on the human resources frame. I recalled many incidents in the past where I had reacted like a mother hen protecting her chicks when I experienced what I considered to be attacks on them. I also had some strengths in the structural frame and considered the symbolic view often enough, but I tended to avoid conflict, negotiation, and developing alliances.

The case study (see Appendix) explores the application of the four frames through the description of a challenge experienced by my library. Many of the events occurred before I attended LIAL and reflect the way I approached problems then, by flipping among the structural,

human resources, and symbolic frames, while I pushed a subordinate to handle the networking and coalition building that we needed. Other events occurred after LIAL and showed how the personal changes inspired by the institute have benefitted my leadership abilities and my organization.

Conclusion

Changes that occur in the thinking and behavior of participants in a leadership institute may be dramatic enough that they fully realize they are going home a changed person. In my case, the changes from my week at LIAL seem to have been subtle and organic, so that they went unnoticed by me initially. Yes, I had enjoyed the lectures and exercises, the social events, and making new friends. I was particularly happy to be attending Harvard for a week and walking the streets of Cambridge. But, when I hopped on the T to head home, I was not convinced I had learned much. Like most professional development opportunities, LIAL seemed at first to have been a nice time away from work to think and talk to colleagues.

But then, I told the story of the lost floor (see Appendix) as a way to inform my management team about reframing and realized that although I operated effectively in three of the frames, I often shied away from the political frame, the one emphasized by the LIAL faculty. As I reflected on this, I discovered that I no longer felt the need to avoid the political frame. The immunity to change exercise had altered my way of thinking, and all of the information I received at LIAL on the importance of navigating the political shoals of academia made perfect sense. By embracing every opportunity to network and discuss the value of the library to the university's mission, we are experiencing a more positive interaction with university administration.

The Hunt Library at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University is a more engaged part of the university in 2013. The building now houses a print collection that is better-used and more focused on the university curriculum, while the new furniture and reconfiguration of service areas has attracted more students on a regular basis than in the preceding three years. When the Office of Undergraduate Research had its grand opening in January 2013, I cut the ribbon with the chief academic officer and the university president, which made me and the library staff feel exceedingly proud.

Borrowing Zolner's metaphor, the vessel of my mind was transformed. The new shape is open to more information and greater experiences. Telling the story revealed this to me in a profound way. I am not sure I would have come to this realization if I filled out a survey or evaluation of the program. Perhaps an area of further research on the effect of LIAL on the leadership growth of its alumni is to ask participants to write the story of the important events in their lives after the program. After all, the case study method is the primary tool of instruction in this program. It may also be valuable as a tool of its evaluation.

LIAL is the only formal leadership institute I have participated in. Many of the lectures, readings, and group work contained familiar content or processes. The case study approach as the primary method of instruction was new to me, and I found it to be effective because I absorb new concepts and ideas more readily through the medium of story than any other. In addition, the immunity to change exercise was transformational for me. It may not have been for others in the same institute. It is difficult to conclude that LIAL would have the same effect on every participant, but it clearly has on many, judging from the enthusiastic articles written by past participants.

In the end, the teaching methods and curriculum of leadership institutes are probably more or less effective, depending on the learning styles and level of participation of the individual participants. The LIAL program was the perfect one for me at this time in my life. As I look back and recognize the significant changes in my leadership and personal interactions with others as a result of that week in August in Cambridge, I was in the perfect program for me at the right time. Perhaps that is the best result we can expect from a leadership program.

Appendix

Case Study and Analysis Using the Four Frames: The Story of the Lost Floor

Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University (ERAU), dedicated to instruction and research in aviation science and aeronautical engineering, offers degrees ranging from associates to PhD. ERAU has residential campuses in Florida and Arizona and over 20,000 distance learning students taking classes at 150 centers around the world or online. In 2012, the university undertook an ambitious five-year plan to enhance its global reputation for research. A major initiative of this plan was the establishment of three centers dedicated to the expansion of undergraduate research and assessment, with the primary center located at the headquarters campus in Daytona Beach, Florida.

One of two ERAU libraries, the Hunt Library, serves the residential campus and university administration in Daytona Beach as well as the distance learning programs. The library staff consists of 20 librarians, 16 library technicians, and several student assistants. The organization is relatively flat, with the majority of staff reporting to three of four associate directors or the director. The four associate directors have responsibility for reference, budget and planning, access services, and electronic and technical Services. The director and associate directors work together as a management team to lead the library.

Opened in 1985, the Hunt Library building contains 42,000 square feet on three floors. The first floor is much larger than the second and third floors, making the building resemble a tiered wedding cake from a distance. An atrium in the middle of the three-storied section of the building provides most of the natural light to that part of the building and is the home to a working glider suspended from the ceiling, one of the most-visited attractions on campus.

In 2007–2008, the university administration, struggling with space constraints brought on by the growth of the university and the loss of some buildings to a tornado in 2006, relocated offices and a coffee shop to the first floor of the Hunt Library building. Although concerned about the loss of student seating, the library management team generally negotiated for cosmetic upgrades and new furniture that made the environment more pleasant. They also consolidated staff offices to open new public areas and mitigate the loss of seating.

Shortly after the current director started in 2009, the chief academic officer (CAO) required more space on the first floor for an administrative office. The director encouraged her managers and staff to accept this change without complaint, for the good of the university, but worried about the ongoing loss of library space. She had recently taken a class on leading in the political environment and understood that she should develop a plan to demonstrate the value of the library to university administrators. She just didn't know how to go about it. Speaking to her superiors outside of routine meetings caused her a great deal of anxiety, so she tended to avoid social functions or university events where she may have had some opportunities to network with the power players on campus. She worried that the administration did not consider the library a vital part of the university and knew it was her responsibility to strengthen the role of the library at the university, but did nothing. She hoped the library space would remain intact, but it did not!

In December 2011, the CAO informed the director that the university administration planned to locate two new departments, Educational Technology (EdTech) and the Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR) to the third floor of the library in the summer of 2012. The third floor at that time housed one-third of the book collection and four group study rooms. These two departments, which were integral to the university's research initiative, needed space in the center of campus, and there was no place else to locate them. The CAO showed the director the plans, which called for filling in the atrium with new flooring on the second and third floors.

How Do We Tell the Others?

Later that afternoon, the director called an emergency management team meeting. She gave the news about the third floor to the associate directors. Team members expressed frustration at the seeming lack of concern for the students who filled the building every day. Where else would they go to study? How would the faculty react to the library eliminating one third of the print collection? What would the building be like once the atrium with its natural light, comfortable seating area, and magnificent glider disappeared? After an hour of this conversation, they decided to hold a staff meeting to explain the circumstances.

The following Monday, the director sent out an e-mail message requiring all staff to attend a special meeting late that morning. The normal joking and conversation that precedes staff meetings at Hunt Library was absent that day. Unexpected staff meetings are not the norm, so everyone seemed to know something was up. As the director began to address the group, the calm she had maintained since first hearing the news about losing the third floor dissolved. Her voice cracked, and she blinked back tears as she recapped the meeting with the CAO. She then invited everyone to ask questions and express their feelings. She assured them that they were in a safe zone and that the management team wanted them to vent.

Shock, anger, and sadness reverberated through the room as one after another, staff members expressed their frustration at an administration that did not seem to recognize the importance of the library space to the students. People spoke about the strong culture of customer service shared by everyone in the library and the praise they regularly received from students and faculty. Many suggested ways to fight back. They thought the library should encourage students to protest the loss of space, or they should refuse to give up the floor.

When the director spoke again, she explained that it would be politically unwise to fight this change. The associate director of reference reminded everyone that the building did not belong to the library staff but to the university. She went on to say that what do belong to the staff did are their customer service ethic and the dedication to students that had been the hallmark of the organization from day one. "The university administration can do what they want with the building," she said, "but no one could take away our dedication to great customer service."

The meeting ended with a discussion of next steps. The management team would develop a document containing their questions and concerns to share with the director of facilities. The managers stressed the importance of staff input and requested feedback by the end of the first week of January. The director also invited anyone to talk to her or one of the associate directors any time they needed to vent. After the meeting, one librarian approached the director and said, "This is a bad situation, but we are in it together, and we can get through anything as long as we stay together."

The Library Takes Action

Armed with their list of questions and concerns, the management team met with the director of facilities and the project architect in late January. As the group walked around the

second and third floors, the librarians asked about the construction project and pointed out some details that had not arisen in earlier planning, such as reinforcing the infill on the second floor to withstand the weight of the books. By the end of this meeting, the architect and director of facilities admitted that they had not considered several of the issues raised by the library administrators and agreed to redraw the plans.

In early February, the director sent a funding proposal to the CAO. In order to ameliorate the reduction of seats and print collections, the management team proposed reconfiguring the reference desk area to create more open seating on the first floor, placing a moratorium on the purchase of print books until after the move from the third floor was completed, and using book money to buy new furniture. The proposal also requested the CAO to match the funds the library was spending, so that the last of the old 1980s furniture could be refreshed. His immediate response was that there was no money at the time. The director interpreted his response to mean there might be some money at another time, so she put the proposal away for a couple of months.

Simultaneously, the associate director for reference, a longtime Hunt Library employee and former interim library director, offered to start working her contacts, especially the director of the OUR. The director, who served on a committee with the EdTech director, then said she would contact him to discuss collaborative planning. The library leaders shared the construction questions with the other two directors and requested the three groups join together to work with facilities on the reconstruction of the building so that the needs of the students would be the highest priority.

The director of EdTech did not respond to the invitation to collaborate, but the director of OUR expressed a strong interest in working together. He invited the library director to his next meeting with the facilities department and shared his plans with her prior to the meeting.

Following this meeting, the directors of the OUR and the library met regularly to discuss ongoing plans and construction timelines. They participated in all construction meetings together.

What Do We Do with All of These Books?

In mid-February, the library embarked on an aggressive weeding project. Already on the library's strategic plan for that year, a preliminary weeding procedure had been drafted. The associate director for access services expanded the procedures into a project plan that included participation from everyone in the library. Most staff jumped into this project because they recognized that the reconstruction gave the library an opportunity to prioritize the long-overdue removal of books that were old and rarely, if ever, used.

The staff areas of the library very quickly became crowded with boxes of books destined for new homes. The library reserved a small number of the books removed from the collection to sell at the semiannual book sale. Some of the proceeds went to partially fund food and soft drinks for students studying in the library during finals. The majority of the books were sent to Better World Books to be resold or recycled. A small share of the proceeds from the sales was donated to the county literacy council.

The initial weeding goal was to weed 15,000 books by the last week of April. One of the staff created a thermometer to measure the weeding progress. Each time a threshold of 5,000 books was pulled out of the catalog, the library threw a party. At one party, dozens of mini-cupcakes were served. At another threshold, the staff had a "make your own sundae" party. During each of these occasions, new information on the weeding process was shared, and the staff joked and showed pictures of the progress.

What Did They Just Say?

In late March, at a planning meeting, the facilities department informed the directors of the library and the OUR that the amount of time and money needed to infill the atrium and reinforce the new floors was not cost-effective. They learned that the administration had found a new home for the EdTech department and the OUR would have the third floor to itself. Construction would be minimal and would take place beginning the second week of May, as soon as finals ended.

The overwhelming response on the library side was relief at not losing the atrium and in gaining a group of people who wanted to work closely with them to provide the best possible resources to students and faculty. Immediately the director of the OUR and the library management team consulted on the best third floor configuration and new, comfortable furniture that would be placed throughout the building. The library director took the funding proposal back to the CAO, and this time he agreed to pay one-third of the cost of replacing outdated furniture.

Although the new plan was welcomed, it created another challenge. By not infilling the second floor, the library had to recalculate the number of books to weed in order to consolidate the collections into a smaller space. The new number was 25,000, and just over a month before finals, staff redoubled their weeding efforts, reaching their goal a few days ahead of the deadline. They celebrated their achievement with a big meal catered by a local restaurant and laughed at the funny stories and pictures they shared about the big weed.

Viewing the Case through the Four Frames

Structural

The structural view of academic leadership casts those in charge as architects, analysts, and systems designers. The basic leadership task is to divide the work and coordinate the

pieces.[35] The structural frame deals with planning. It is often the first approach leaders take when faced with the prospect of change.

The structural frame is apparent throughout the case. At the beginning of each new phase and relationship, the management team developed plans, procedures, and processes to move the organization along to the end that the CAO required of them. They sought input and created plans related to moving the collections, weeding, restructuring open space, seeking additional funding, and forming partnerships.

The library leaders used the initial plans as their roadmap through the process and adjusted them as necessary. When the university changed course on the extent of the construction, library leaders adjusted their roadmap to meet the alterations. In addition, as they worked more closely with the director of the OUR and received funding from the CAO for new furniture, they altered earlier strategies to meet the new situation. Throughout the process, each new change initiated a return to the structural frame to tweak the roadmaps.

Human Resources

The human resources view of academic leadership sees the organization as an extended family and the leader as a servant, catalyst, or coach. The basic leadership task of this frame is to facilitate the alignment between organizational and individual needs.[36] In this frame, the leader's thoughts turn to the people in the organization and focus on ways to take care of them.

Evidence of the human resources frame arises early in the case. When the management team met with staff, they encouraged them to share their emotions and ideas. They validated these by incorporating staff feedback into the planning documents. The library leaders also communicated with their subordinates in a positive and supportive way.

The management team encouraged everyone in the library to play a role in the projects needed to consolidate the collections onto the first two floors of the building. They participated by weeding, pulling books, and helping at the book sale. They also fed the staff while encouraging questions and feedback and laughter when they met to discuss and celebrate their progress. From the beginning, the library leadership maintained a positive attitude in all their communication with staff. This engendered camaraderie in the library, and everyone felt like they were in it together. They were an extended family.

Political

A jungle is the metaphor for the organization in the political view of academic leadership. The basic leadership tasks in this frame are bargaining, negotiating, building coalitions, setting agendas, and managing conflict. The emphasis of the political frame is the allocation of power and scarce resources.[37] In this case, the crux of the situation is the lack of an important resource, sufficient space on the Daytona Beach campus. Additionally, one of the players in a potential conflict over the space, the OUR, is empowered by the administration because it is the primary engine of the university's current highest priority.

The library director understood immediately from the CAO that the library power in this situation was limited as she discovered plans had been developed for library space with no input from her. In consultation with her management team, one of her first moves was to set an agenda in which the management team could offer input. They met with the architects and builders to ask questions and provide facts about the building that contributed to a change in the construction plan, which benefitted the library.

The management team understood that the library would be moved off the third floor, regardless of any action they might take to prevent this happening. They also acknowledged the

importance of the OUR to current university priorities and the fact that the building held a print collection that was old and, in many cases, unused. So they used the situation to their advantage by developing a relationship with a powerful colleague, making progress toward a requirement from the administration, and negotiating for additional resources to make the library a better place for students.

Symbolic

In the symbolic frame, the institution is viewed as a temple or theater. The leadership tasks are to see possibilities; create common vision; manage meaning; and infuse passion, creativity, and soul into the work of the organization. Leaders working in this frame use ceremonies, rituals, stories, and vision to motivate and celebrate success.[38]

There are several times in the case where the management team operated in the symbolic frame. The most pronounced of these appear in the weeding process. They threw parties to congratulate themselves on their progress. They also created a large thermometer that they kept in a staff area and updated as the weeding progressed. At each of the parties, they shared pictures and funny stories about flagging the books or packing them up to ship them out of the building. In addition, each of the management team members led by example. They participated in some aspect of the weeding or deaccessioning process. The director determined that no one could complain about the assignments they received in this process because she was up in the stacks every week weeding her assigned areas, which were larger than many of the others.

Other evidence of the symbolic frame occur in the first staff meeting where the director allowed herself to show some emotion as she explained the circumstances and in the story of the strong customer service ethic that the associate director for reference related, reminding everyone what their highest priority and strengths are. In addition, the symbolic view is apparent

in the disposal of the books that were weeded. They went to an organization that supports sustainability, or they were sold to raise money to buy food for students while they study for finals in the library.

The Rest of the Story: After the Dust Cleared

In August 2012 the library director participated in LIAL. The experience was profoundly positive. When she returned to work, she set aside an hour to describe the benefits of the program. As she thought about the best way to explain reframing to the associate directors, she retold the story of the lost floor, pointing out to them the many times they successfully navigated the challenges by viewing situations through different frames. As she reflected on the experience of the last several months, she realized the number of times she had avoided the political view or expected the associate director for reference to handle the political aspects of the situation. She thought about how much the political frame had been emphasized in the LIAL program and realized that it was her job to operate from this viewpoint rather than to abdicate this responsibility to a subordinate.

In the fall of 2013, capitalizing on the relationship she had forged with the director of the Office of Undergraduate Research (OUR), she enlisted him as an ally in the library's goal to secure funding and support for the establishment of an institutional repository (IR). Together, they convinced the chief information officer (CIO) of the benefits to ERAU of an IR and arranged for vendors to demonstrate IR products to administrators and faculty.

She also started attending social events and ceremonies in other departments. She made a point of speaking to the president, vice presidents, deans, and faculty at each of these occasions. She emphasized the positive aspects of locating the OUR in the library building and spoke passionately about the benefits of providing open access to ERAU research through the

establishment of the IR, assuring all who had doubts because of anticipated workload increases that the library would manage it. Before long, she started receiving requests to attend meetings to explain how the library would advance university priorities by establishing and maintaining an IR. In late December, the university signed a contract with a leading provider of IR platforms, and she led the steering committee that is overseeing the implementation.

Notes

[1] For more information about all of the Harvard Institutes for Higher Education, see http://www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe/programs/higher-education/.

[2] Association of College and Research Libraries, "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute."

[3] Saunders, "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute."

[4] Mason and Wetherbee, "Learning to Lead."

[5] Harvard University, "Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians."

[6] Gjelten and Fishel, "Developing Leaders and Transforming Libraries."

[7] Bolman and Deal, *Modern Approaches*; Bolman and Gallos, *Reframing Academic Leadership*.

[8] Sullivan, "Case Studies Method," 115.

[9] Harvard University, "Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians."

[10] Information on Kegan's research areas and publications is available at http://www.gse.harvard.edu/directory/faculty/faculty-detail/?fc=318&flt=k&sub=all.

[11] In 2012, this session was conducted by Lisa Lahey and based on the book by Kegan and Lahey, *Immunity to Change*.

[12] Bolman and Deal, *Modern Approaches*.

[13] Bolman and Deal, *Reframing Organizations*.

[14] Ibid., 11.

[15] Ibid., 14.

[16] The frames are covered in some detail in the case analysis in the Appendix.

[17] Hardesty, "ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute," 805.

[18] Saunders, "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute," 647.

[19] Bilyeu, Gaunt, and Glogowski, "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute."

[20] Hardesty, "ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute."

[21] Golian and Donlan, "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute."

[22] Gilreath, "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute."

[23] Garten, "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute."

[24] Masselink and Jacobsma, "Reframing our Viewpoint."

[25] Kalin, "Reframing Leadership," 261–70.

[26] Dancik, "Borrowing from the Balcony."

[27] Bolman and Deal, *Modern Approaches.*

[28] Bolman, "Research Using or Influenced."

[29] Yi, "The Management of Change."

[30] Yi, "Conducting Meetings"; Yi, "Setting Goals."

[31] Tripuraneni, "Leader or Manager."

[32] Herold, "An Examination of the Leadership Program."

[33] Chu, "Framing Reference Encounters"; Linn, "Perspectives on Managing a Library."

[34] Bolman and Gallos, *Reframing Academic Leadership*.

[35] Bolman and Gallos, *Reframing Academic Leadership*, 50.

[36] Ibid., 93.

[37] Ibid., 72.

[38] Ibid., 110.

Bibliography

Association of College and Research Libraries. "ACRL Harvard leadership Institute for

    Academic Librarians." Accessed February 7, 2013.

    http://www.ala.org/conferencesevents/acrl-harvard-leadership-institute-academic-

    librarians.

Bilyeu, David, Marianne Gaunt, and Maryruth Glogowski. "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute:

    Three Participants Share Their Rewarding Experiences." *College & Research Libraries*

    News 61, no. 2 (2000): 106–20.

Bolman, Lee G. "Research Using or Influenced by Bolman & Deal's Four Frames." Last

    modified July 2011. Accessed February 9, 2013.

    http://www.leebolman.com/four_frame_research.htm.

Bolman, Lee G., and Terrence E. Deal. *Modern Approaches to Managing and Understanding*

    Organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

———. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice, and Leadership.* 4th ed. San Francisco:

    Jossey-Bass, 2008.

Bolman, Lee G., and Joan V. Gallos. *Reframing Academic Leadership.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2011.

Chu, Felix T. "Framing Reference Encounters." *RQ* 36, no. 1 (1996): 93–101.

Dancik, Deborah B. "Borrowing from the Balcony." *College & Research Libraries News* 67, no. 3 (2006): 166–67, 176.

Garten, Ed. "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute: A Five-Year Old Spreads Its Wings." *College & Research Libraries News* 65, no. 2 (2004): 81–83.

Gilreath, Charles. "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute: Highlights form the Fourth Annual Institute." *College & Research Libraries New*s 64, no. 2 (2003): 90–91.

Gjelten, Dan, and Teresa Fishel. "Developing Leaders and Transforming Libraries: Leadership Institutes for Librarians." *College & Research Libraries News* 67, no. 7 (2006): 409–12.

Golian, Linda Marie, and Rebecca Donlan. "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute: Highlights form the Third Annual Institute." *College & Research Libraries News* 62, no. 11 (2001): 1069–72.

Hardesty, Larry. "ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute: Still Receiving Winning Reviews in Its Second Year." *College & Research Libraries News* 61, no. 9 (2000): 805–07.

Harvard University. Graduate School of Education. "Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians: Program Objectives." Accessed February 8, 2013. http://www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe/programs/higher-education/portfolio/leadership-academic-librarians.html.

———. "Leadership Institute for Academic Librarians: Who Should Attend." Accessed February 8, 2013. http://www.gse.harvard.edu/ppe/programs/higher-education/portfolio/leadership-academic-librarians.html.

Herold, Irene M. H. "An Examination of the Leadership Program for College Library Directors

    Associated with ACRL's College Libraries Section." PhD diss., Simmons College, 2012.

    ProQuest (ATT 3515783).

Kalin, Sally W. "Reframing leadership: The ACRL/Harvard Leadership Institute for Academic

    Librarians," *Journal of Business & Finance Librarianship* 13, no. 3 (2008): 261–70.

    doi:10.1080/08963560802183047.

Kegan, Robert, and Lisa Laskow Lahey. *Immunity to Change: How to Overcome It and Unlock*

    the Potential in Yourself and Your Organization. Boston: Harvard Business Press, 2009.

Linn, Mott. "Perspectives on Managing a Library." *The Bottom Line: Managing Library*

    Finances 21, no. 4 (2008): 124–28. doi: 10.1108/08880450810929107.

Mason, Florence M., and Louella V. Wetherbee. "Learning to Lead: An Analysis of Current

    Training Programs for Library Leadership." *Library Trends* 53, no. 1 (2004): 187–217.

Masselink, Linda, and Kelly Jacobsma. "Reframing our Viewpoint: The 6th ACRL Harvard

    Leadership Institute." *College & Research Libraries News* 66, no. 2 (2005): 99–101.

Saunders, Laverna. "ACRL Harvard Leadership Institute: Professional Development at Its Best."

    College & Research Libraries News 60, no. 8 (1999): 645–47.

Sullivan, Maureen. "Case Studies Method: An Overview." In *Shaping the Future: Advancing the*

    Understanding of Leadership, edited by Peter Hernon, 115–17. Santa Barbara, CA:

    Libraries Unlimited, 2010.

Tripuraneni, Vinaya L. "Leader or Manager: Academic Library Leader's Leadership Orientation

    Considered Ideal by Faculty, Administrators, and Librarians at Private, Nonprofit

    Doctoral Universities in Southern California." PhD diss., University of LaVerne, 2010.

    ProQuest (ATT 3430266).

Yi, Zhixian. "Conducting Meetings in the Change Process: Approaches of Academic Library

    Directors in the United States." *Library Management* 33, no. 1 (2012): 22–35. doi:

    10.1108/01435121211203293.

———. "The Management of Change in the Information Age: Approaches of Academic Library

    Directors in the United States." PhD diss., Texas Woman's University, 2010. ProQuest

    (ATT 3414408).

———. "Setting Goals for Change in the Information Age: Approaches of Academic Library

    Directors in the USA." *Library Management* 34, no. 1/2: 5–19. doi:

    10.1108/01435121311298234.