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ABSTRACT

This study reports research about innovation and change in the professional practice of the staff at the Library and Information Service (LIS) staff at Curtin University of Technology, Perth, in Western Australia. The historical context of the study is Australian higher education and university libraries in the early 1990s. It reports, examines and analyzes key events and activities of the LIS staff strategic planning process both as an educational innovation and a driver of change in professional practice. The investigation of educational innovation and change is the object of the study, specifically the application of strategic planning.

Literature from the 30-year history of writing and research about educational innovation and change is reviewed in terms of its relevance to the study. In addition, selected literature about organizational theory and strategic planning in libraries is presented. From this literature emerged the particular innovation and change framework, which guide the research.

A justification for the selection of the particular research approach is explained and data collection, organization and analysis are described. The study uses official LIS corporate records as its primary source of data, supplemented by published materials to assist in the explanation of the particular circumstances of the LIS case.

The results of the data analysis are presented in terms of the key events and activities of the LIS case. From this analysis conclusions are drawn in relation to the research questions which underpin the study and in terms of the component parts of the innovation and change framework. In particular, conclusions relate to the key organizational factors shaping the response to innovation; the characteristics of the context of change; key organizational processes helping to ensure successful adoption; the articulation of a shared vision and processes to ensure a shared vision. In relation to the innovation and
change framework the change process is viewed as adoption dominated; as a move towards a learning organization; through the characteristics of the context of change and through other factors influencing change.

Flowing from the research findings, recommendations are made for professional practice and further research.

As a case study that reports, examines and analyses the complex dimensions of organizational change, the study is rich in detail and provides a real-life example of organizational and educational change.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

This chapter presents the background, context and setting for the study, outlines the purpose, describes the significance of the study, presents the research questions to be addressed, overviews the research design and limitations of the study and defines key terminology used in the study. An overview of the presentation of the thesis is also provided.

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Educational institutions in the 1990s
During the decade of the 1990s educational institutions worldwide experienced enormous pressures from a range of social, economic, technological and political factors and it was generally accepted that the pace of organizational change was rapid. Globalisation and developments in information technology impacted in profound ways on the activities of universities, and Australian institutions did not escape these global pressures. In the 1990s, the universities of virtually all the advanced industrial economies were “battered by the winds of change” and the Australian position was “in no way unique” (Maslen & Slattery, 1994).

Australian universities in the 1990s were also subjected to a number of domestic pressures. These included a public sector reform agenda, initiated by the Commonwealth Government in the late 1980s. The movement toward “economic rationalism” found realisation in policies that closed down a number of public utilities, applying user-pays principles, introducing reform to higher education, attempting to privatise government-owned assets, and so on (Battin, 1991). As part of that reform agenda, Governments were keen to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their public sector operations.
While reforms initially concentrated on government departments they eventually spread to influence the activities of all categories of taxpayer funded organizations, including the higher education sector inclusive of universities. By the mid-1990s these reforms saw the introduction of contemporary financial, accountability and management practices into the public sector; the imposition of cuts in the budgets of public sector organizations; and the opening up of parts of public service provision to private providers. Concepts of economic rationalism and corporate managerialism were beginning to affect the educational domain and were a force behind the structural reform movement in education (Battin, 1991; Chapman, 1990). For example, these philosophies found expression in universities through sector-wide initiatives, such as the quality audit rounds initiated by the Department of Employment, Education and Training (DEET) in 1995 (Williamson & Exon, 1996). The philosophical basis for these reforms was a desire to see universities serve national economic ends, secured by much more direct steering by government (Coadrake & Stedman, 1998).

**The Dawkins era**

The release of key government policy papers in 1987 and 1988 by the then Minister for Education, the Hon John Dawkins, signalled the beginning of reform within the higher education sector (1987; 1988). It also marked the beginning of very significant change, ambivalence and uncertainty in the higher education sector and in universities in particular. The 1987 Green Paper, *Higher Education: a Policy Discussion Paper* laid out in broad terms the nature and extent of change being considered by the Federal Government. The 1988 White Paper, *Higher Education: A Policy Statement*, effected change through legislative weight and authority. Reforms from this era resulted in significant system expansion, performance based funding, equity of access and the linking of education with economic recovery.
The reforms sprang from a particular moment in time when the government, increasingly aware of Australia’s role in the global marketplace, sought to restructure the economy: to make it more efficient, competitive and responsive (Maslen & Slattery, 1994). This period was marked by increased Commonwealth Government intervention in the sector that was aimed at rationalising the higher education system and relating it to the needs of the economy (Miller, 1995). The reforms were significant and far-reaching and as such “bear the unmistakable stamp of the economic rationalist ideology that dominated thinking in Canberra in the late 1980s” (Maslen & Slattery, 1994).

In a retrospective evaluation of the 13 years of Labor Government changes to the higher education sector, it was noted that no other government in the history of Australia has produced such far-reaching changes in higher education and that:

Labor changed the way we practise research, as well as the way we define and value it. It changed the place of teaching, the modes of delivery and the relations between sectors, the pattern of rewards and incentives, and the main lines of accountability. It opened higher education to the external world in quite a new way. It helped make us global, and opened us to east and southeast Asia, more quickly and completely than we would have done so ourselves (Marginson, 1996 p. 8).

Pressures for change - universities
Successive Commonwealth Labor governments through until 1996 drove changes within the higher education sector and the election of a coalition government in 1996 did not signal the end of reforms within the sector. Therefore, throughout the 1990s Australian universities experienced various pressures from a reform agenda designed to improve their performance and accountability. In these circumstances, change was constant and university staff heard a great deal about the quality agenda, strategic planning, performance
indicators, benchmarking, performance-driven research funding, competition and performance management for staff (Coaldrake & Stedman, 1998).

 Massive social changes, such as the composition of the workforce, the nature of work and its relationship to leisure time and the advent of new technologies, were having their impacts on universities too. New technologies, in particular, offered challenges to universities as semi-independent resource-based learning now offered an alternative to the long established practice of university learning taking place through contact with a teacher in real time (Reid, 1996).

 It was generally accepted that as Australia moved away from the post-industrial age toward the information age and the creation of a knowledge-based society, success would depend on the ability of individuals to be adaptable, to learn new skills and to make sense of the ever-increasing stockpile of information. Australians would need to be life-long learners and Australia was to become “the clever country” (Commonwealth Schools Commission, 1987).

 The Clever Country assumption, first articulated in September 1987, accepts a number of tenets including the continuance of major change to all facets of society, the dominant role of science and technology in any future social or industrial scenario, a “global” economy, the increasing importance of people-based (service) industries, the need to recognise Australia’s position in the Asia-Pacific region, a multi-cultural and equitable nation and workforce, and the role of knowledge and skills which will create “flexible and adaptable” people and organizations (Campbell, 1995).

 While the traditional goal of a modern university, namely to pursue, evaluate, communicate and apply knowledge was still considered valid, universities were being challenged to think about equity and access to courses and how courses might be delivered, especially in the new and emerging electronic information
environment (Reid, 1996). The opportunities afforded by new electronic media, communication and information technologies provided universities with additional challenges and opportunities. By the mid-1990s some educators were contending that the arrival of the Internet and worldwide web technology could serve to revolutionise education. Meanwhile, this same technology was predicted to have a great impact on patterns of scholarly communication and publishing.

Pressures for change - university libraries

In the context of universities, many of these sector-wide pressures converged: particularly so in the environment of university libraries. Indeed, it has been argued that library and information services are especially subject to change (Pattison & Williamson, 1993).

The pressures experienced by institutions found expression in their university libraries as university libraries do not and cannot exist in isolation from the community they seek to serve. However, university libraries too were experiencing their own particular, industry-specific pressures and change forces. Several writers have identified the possible causes of such pressures for change (Lamberton, 1993; Pattison & Williamson, 1993). At the macro level the following pressures were apparent:

- Growth in the volume of published information.
- Rising costs of acquisition, including the effects of changes in exchange rates.
- New technology acquired through “technology push” and “demand pull”.
- Costs of adaptation, including the costs of operating old and new technologies in parallel.
- Increase numbers of libraries which may have denied the benefit of some economies of scale.
- Change in scope: interdisciplinary studies, university-industry partnerships, internationalisation.
- Added library functions, such as copying and searching (Lamberton, 1993).

While at the micro level the following factors were also contributing:
- The increasing focus on information as a resource which can contribute significantly to organizational success, and even competitive advantage.
- The recognition of information as a commodity which can be marketed, including the marketing of government information.
- The social focus on information policy issues relating to privacy, security, freedom of information, and the “information rich” versus the “information poor”.
- The advances in technologies used to collect, store, retrieve and communicate information, opening the way for a host of new information services.
- The continuing “information explosion” forcing collaboration between information providers rather than independence in collecting information within a single organization.
- Blurring of the traditional boundaries between libraries, records departments, archives and computing services.
- Increasingly high expectations from clients for quality of service, which translates into demands for “the right information at the right place at the right time” at a reasonable cost.
- The requirement to demonstrate the costs effectiveness of library and information services (Pattison & Williamson, 1993).

Given these factors, the environment of university libraries at the beginning of the 1990s was therefore particularly vulnerable. There was much discussion both in the library professional literature and at specialist industry forums held
at the beginning of the 1990s about electronic and virtual libraries and what these developments might mean for the professional practice of library staff.

While toward the mid to late 1990s the realities and day-to-day interactions with the Internet and worldwide web technology had become matter-of-fact and mostly a daily occurrence, up until about 1994 Internet usage was not commonplace in the professional practice of university libraries in Australia. Across the sector worldwide there was some experimentation with electronic information underway in some leading-edge university libraries. For example, the Electronic Library Project at Tilburg University in the Netherlands aimed to have a library of the future, which could take advantage of new technologies (Geleijnse, 1993). However, for the vast majority of practitioners, working with electronic information sources was something which was read about in futuristic terms rather than experienced on a day-to-day basis.

Several writers and speakers at specialist industry-based forums at the beginning of the decade of the 1990s pondered the future of academic libraries worldwide, for example Dougherty (1991) and Buckland (1992) and of Australian university libraries in particular Rayward (1992) and Mulvaney (1993).

The two Australian forums focused particularly on the difficult times faced by Australian university libraries and the future of scholarly publishing. *Confronting the future - university libraries in the next decade* was held at the University of New South Wales on the 12 June 1992 and *Changes in scholarly communication patterns: Australia and the electronic library* was held in Canberra from 14 to 16 April 1993. The record of proceedings from both these forums provides an interesting historical insight into how the key players at the time viewed the complex world in which Australian university libraries in particular operated. For example, the edited proceeding from *Confronting the future - university libraries in the next decade* noted that “university libraries are
in the midst of great changes some of which would seem to have enormous potential for enabling them to contribute more effectively than now to institutional and national education goals” (Rayward, 1992). While the opening address at *Changes in scholarly communication patterns: Australia and the electronic library* presented the image of “the academic library as a complex and somewhat unwieldy system, being battered by the forces of change” (Sheenhan, 1993).

*Confronting the future - university libraries in the next decade* was concerned with academic libraries as a special group of libraries and with exploring issues (Rayward, 1992). Meanwhile, the international invitation-only forum *Changes in scholarly communication patterns: Australia and the electronic library* brought together experts from the academic, government, library, computing, commercial and network environments to tackle a range of issues described as “prodigious in their scope and complexity” (Sheenhan, 1993).

Indeed, the future of library provision in Australian higher education institutions was considered important enough for the then Higher Education Council to commission a major review. Among other things the review was to assess the present condition of Australian higher education libraries and the impact of new technologies for information storage and interlibrary communication (Ross, 1990). The final report from the review, known as *The Ross Report*, provides a detailed snapshot of the condition of Australian higher education libraries at the beginning of the 1990s and reflects some of the thinking about possible future directions for professional practice into the 1990s that were prevalent around that time. It also shows that aspects of technology, process and procedures of professional practice were under scrutiny.
The Australian parliament also took some interest in the role of Australian libraries in an information society around this time. In 1991 a major report from a House of Representatives standing committee was released (Jones, 1991).

The impact of the continuous change and pressure on staff working in libraries was also a topic of concern and interest in many of the discussions about the future of university libraries around the beginning of the decade. At the opening address at the 1993 forum *Changes in scholarly communication patterns: Australia and the electronic library*, the Chair, Peter Sheenhan, made the following comments. He described the 1990s world of the university libraries as “an age of continuous change and turbulence” and went on to say that “to survive and cope well, we need not only to have good ideas about appropriate change to university systems but we need to pay considerable attention to how change is implemented…. Well managed change means making the best use of people resources” (Sheenhan in Mulvaney & Steele, 1993 p. 6).

Some industry representatives alluded to the need for change in the professional practice and attitudes of library staff. Again at the 1993 industry forum *Changes in scholarly communication patterns: Australia and the electronic library*, it was suggested that librarians may need to abandon certain assumptions and mindsets, remaining flexible about the purpose of libraries in this new environment (Sheenhan, 1993). In this context the long tradition of professional practice for librarians to be constrained to use up most of their time on laborious methods of collection, classification and dissemination of information was questioned. The promise of new systems and information technologies offered library staff the opportunity to create a new approach to professional practice.

There was also speculation about the possibility of a significant paradigm shift in the professional practice of library staff. This major strategic change
involved moving away from the traditional professional practice of acquiring and owning print-based scholarly information resources (the ownership model) towards an increasing reliance on access to networked scholarly information resources (the access model). Some library practitioners and writers describe this shift as a move away from collection building, (just in case) the information is required, to access, (just in time) when the information is required - or a move from a “just in case” library to a “just in time” library (Buckland, 1992; Exon, 1993).

For individual libraries operating in the context of their particular campus and clientele, sector pressures and industry-specific pressures met with local conditions to create uncertainty. Nevertheless, there was a general level of acceptance by library staff both within individual libraries and across the sector that turbulent times demanded new approaches and that change was inevitable. How the staff of individual libraries responded to the challenges and opportunities of the 1990s are matters not solely influenced by sector-wide pressure and industry-specific pressure. Institutional conditions, such as the organizational culture, style of leadership and local traditions of professional practice within particular libraries were also important in determining how individual libraries responded.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Broad issues
Given the experiences of educational institutions with change during the 1990s, it is important to reflect on the change process and in particular to consider how change is introduced and managed within educational organizations. How educational organizations absorb and bring into effect new ideas, policies and/or practices and generally bring about change to enhance and improve professional practice is a complex process.
This study is concerned with innovation and change in an educational setting of an Australian university library. It seeks to examine a strategic planning process from the perspective of it being both an innovation in itself and a driver of change in professional practice. Accordingly, while strategic planning is the focus of the study, it is considered from the broader perspective of educational innovation and change. The study examines the first year of a strategic planning process in the educational setting of a large university library – the Library and Information Service (LIS) at Curtin University of Technology in Perth, Western Australia.

The study seeks to identify particular factors that contribute to successful innovation and change, particularly those affecting the adoption phases of the innovation. It also examines the value of using a strategic planning process to drive change. What makes for successful innovation and change in professional practice in an educational setting is the central focus of the study.

Significance of the study
Innovation and change are fundamental to most systems and organizations for their continuance and survival. That is how new ideas, policies and practices come into being and that is how professional practice evolves. Examining in detail the experiences of one particular innovation and the change triggered by that innovation, and building a framework derived from the literature to help explain and analyze that process, contributes to the body of knowledge about innovation and change in educational settings. While recognizing that one case study is very unlikely to provide sufficient data to extend theory on educational change, it may provide some insights, which in turn, may be further explored. The study may help others to better understand the complex nature and characteristics of educational innovation and change.
This study has a number of significant features. In particular, it uses a contemporary theoretical perspective developed from 1990s literature on change and innovation to examines change in a particular case and it draws on previous research. The study also examines the appropriateness of strategic planning in guiding the organizational development.

This study chronicles, analyzes and reports on an experience with innovation and change and as such provides a robust and rich study which may be of benefit to others in educational environments attempting to implement innovative practice to bring about fundamental change in professional practice.

This study builds on and extends theoretical approaches to understanding innovation and strategic change. As such it offers a practical example of how university library staff set about to respond to a turbulent and complex environment by charting a desired future through strategic planning and systematically working over time to achieve change and to bring the desired state into reality. It is an actual case study, examined retrospectively and informed by a theoretical framework, educational theories and contextual information. This study offers to others insights into a complex array of processes that constitute the dynamics of change.

Research questions
The following research questions have been specifically framed to help gain insight into how successful innovation and change in professional practice can be facilitated in the educational setting of a university library and information service. Therefore, within LIS:

- What key organizational factors help to shape the organization’s response to innovation?
To what extent do the characteristics of the context of change, expressed in terms of setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions, influence the adoption of the innovation and the nature and extent of the change process?

What key organizational processes help ensure the successful adoption of an innovation?

Within a strategic planning process how critical is the articulation of a shared vision for driving change in professional practice?

What particular processes help to ensure a shared vision?

Research design and limitations
Case studies, especially qualitative case studies, are prevalent throughout the field of education and have been used over some 30 years to help illustrate educational practice as it relates to students, programs, schools, innovations, teachers and policies (Merriam, 1992). One of the advantages of the case study approach is that it allows the researcher close access to particular phenomenon in their natural setting. Given the complexity and dynamics of the research focus, the use of a case study approach in this particular research was viewed as appropriate.

This study can be viewed as a case study because it examines the experiences of LIS staff with innovation and change. The case, while influenced by a range of complex factors both internal and external to the LIS, is bounded by the natural setting and context of LIS within the University.

The case study also has some characteristics usually associated with historical research in that it systematically searches for data to answer questions about a past phenomenon for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of present institutions, practices, trends and issues in education (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996). In particular, the case study examines LIS staff experiences retrospectively.
during the timeframe of the 1990s with particular reference to the first year of the strategic planning process.

One of the features of case studies in education is the wide variety of data collection and data analysis techniques used. This case study draws on techniques for data collection and data analysis that are usually associated with historical research. In particular, the study uses selected documentary records created, as part of the LIS strategic planning process and at the time by the LIS staff directly involved, as its primary source of data. Such records have been defined as written communications that have an official purpose (Gall et al., 1996) and reviewed in the context in which they were created these records provide a rich source of data for the study.

A limitation in terms of the scope of this study is that it examines only one experience of innovation and change within a particular set of circumstances and as such this study cannot claim to be comprehensive. While this study reports on the dynamics of the change process, the results may not be applicable more generally to other organizations implementing innovation or attempting to bring about strategic change in professional practice. It may not be applicable in other educational settings or other areas within universities.

Definitions
For the purposes of the study the following terms, listed in alphabetical order, have been given specific definitions.

- **Actions** – a characteristic of the context of change and refers to specific things done in the course of the change process.

- **Actors** – a characteristic of the context of change and refers to the people involved in interacting with an innovation.
- **Change** – refers to the process which alters behaviors, attitudes, structures, procedures or outputs of some unit or organization.

- **Curtin University of Technology (or Curtin)** – refers to the educational institution created through legislation in 1987, when the Western Australian Institute of Technology (WAIT) became Curtin University of Technology.

- **Innovation** - an object, idea, policy or practice that is perceived to be new and which triggers change. An important feature of innovation is that it is perceived as novel whether it is new, or not.

- **Issues** – a characteristic of the context of change and refers to any particular matters arising during the course of the change process.

- **Library and Information Service (LIS)** – refers to the department within Curtin University of Technology which operates under the organizational authority of the University Librarian and is used throughout the thesis.

However, there are some direct quotations from the LIS corporate records where other related terms have been used. For example, the Robertson Library, the T. L. Robertson Library, the Library, Curtin Library and the University Library, etc.

The terminology of LIS appears to have come into common usage sometime during 1992. Its development seems to have been evolutionary, first being used in a somewhat generic form as was common in the professional library literature at the time. Accordingly, there are references to “library and information service” and “information and library service”. The term also formally appeared in minutes of the University Academic Board in July
1992 (LIS Corporate Record, 1992n). The Decision Conference of August 1992 when using computer modelling, used the abbreviation of CUTLIS (derived from Curtin University of Technology Library and Information Service). This abbreviation was used for a while after the Decision Conference in documentation. However, it later became shortened to Library and Information Service (LIS).

- **Professional Practice** – the application of a combination of a body of theoretical knowledge, practical skills and abilities in a particular setting and context. For example, teachers undertake professional practice in the setting of classrooms in an educational context. Librarians working in the setting of a university library, undertake their professional practice in an educational context.

- **Scenarios** – a characteristic of the context of change and describes possible alternatives or options available during the course of the change process.

- **Scene** – a characteristic of the context of change and refers to the specific location within the setting of the change process (e.g. a department within a university).

- **Setting** – a characteristic of the context of change and refers to the broad location in which the change process takes place (e.g. a university).

- **Strategic Planning** – a process of continuous planning for change, which assesses an organization’s or program’s internal and external environment, analyzes the implications of relevant trends, and identifies effective strategies for achieving a desired future state.
More specific terms relating to educational innovation and change and organizational theory are defined in Chapter 2 in the context of their classical usage and origins within educational theory.

**ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS**

In addition to this introductory chapter, the thesis is organized into six chapters.

Chapter 2 reviews a range of educational literature about educational innovation and change, aspects of organizational theory, as well as literature about strategic planning in libraries. From this literature a generic innovation and change framework developed, which was subsequently applied to the examination of the LIS case.

Chapter 3 presents the methodology used in the study, including a rationale for the use of case study and a description of how the data for the study was collected, accessed, located, organized and analyzed.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the LIS case. It presents a descriptive chronology and narrative of events and activities of the LIS staff and their experiences of strategic planning, both as educational innovation and as driver for change in professional practice.

Chapter 5 presents the analysis of findings in relation to the research questions detailed in chapter 1. This chapter also combines the innovation and change framework from chapter 2 with the circumstances of the case as outlined in chapter 4 to present findings in relation to the theoretical framework.

Chapter 6 presents recommendations for professional practice and for further educational research.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This chapter reviews a range of educational literature of relevance to the study. In particular, the literature about educational innovation and change and aspects of organizational theory as it pertains to innovation and change in educational settings, is discussed. In addition, literature about strategic planning in libraries is also reviewed to help establish the context of such planning and to explain some of the technical aspects of the planning process.

Emerging from the literature review a generic theoretical framework about educational innovation and change emerged. This framework is presented, developed, tailored and then applied to the circumstances of the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW- EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION AND CHANGE

Overview
The literature about innovation and change, especially about the management of change in organizations, is vast and it frequently crosses discipline boundaries. In recent times much of this literature has a business orientation and is focused on how modern business ideas are helping to shape and change organizations. For example, trends towards economic rationalism, privatization and the adoption of corporate managerialism are written about in terms of how they are changing organizations.

Some of this business orientation and terminology is also beginning to find its way into the literature about innovation and change in educational organizations (Battin, 1991). Nevertheless, the vast bulk of the literature about educational innovation and change remains focused on the implementation of specific curriculum, technological and other forms of classroom and administrative
innovation. Most theories to emerge from the educational research tend to be presented and explained through theoretical models, and the literature abounds with such models, variously described as models, frameworks, perspectives, phases/stages and/or sub-processes.

Studies of innovation and change in educational settings using models derived from the educational research are well represented in the literature, for example (Bright, 1985; Jacobus, 1997; Osborne, 1993; 1994; Rutherford, 1983). At least one study using some selected theories about educational innovation and change has been undertaken about how new ideas are disseminated and adopted in the public library profession in North America (Pungitore, 1995).

It is this body of educational research and literature about educational innovation and change that most directly impacts on the shape and nature of this study. It is from educational research and literature that the study derives its theoretical and contextual basis. While much of this literature has a focus around schools and classrooms, its content and theories are readily and frequently applied to various types of educational organizations (such as colleges and universities) and settings within those organizations (such as the library or administration departments within the school or university). In particular, except perhaps for some general descriptive works which focus on technological change in libraries, there is an absence of research literature about innovation and change in libraries.

**Innovation versus invention**

In the context of educational organizations it is generally accepted that innovation is to do with something (an idea, practice or product) that is perceived to be new or novel whether it is or not (Spence, 1994). Innovation is sometimes confused with invention. That is because inventions are certainly innovations since, by definition, they are something new but innovations need
not be inventions (Spence, 1994). Accordingly, organizations do not necessarily have to create or invent the new idea or technique. It is considered new (or an innovation) insofar as its use or incorporation represents a departure from the organization’s own traditions and current practices (Pungitore, 1995).

It is also generally accepted that innovation triggers change. This linkage between innovation and change often increases the confusion, especially when the two terms are used interchangeably. It is important therefore to note the distinction between them. The term innovation is used to describe a product or policy, whereas change refers to a process by which behaviors, attitudes, structures, procedures or outputs of some unit or organization are altered (Dellar, 1990).

Change theory
Extensive research over a 30-year period since the 1960s has revealed much about educational change and produced a vast amount of literature. It has been said that reviewing this literature can be a most confusing task (Dellar, 1990). Nevertheless, at least one comprehensive work, which sorts through this literature and integrates and synthesizes it into a very readable account has emerged (Fullan, 1991). While other writers have offered more condensed reviews and summaries (Larson, 1988), (Sashkin & Egermeier, 1992; Sashkin & Egermeier, 1993). Others with a more general interest in how change impacts on organizations have also made good contributions and provided explanations and ideas about change, which are obviously applicable in both the business and education environments (Spence, 1994).

From the specific literature cited in these reviews and from the reviews themselves, some commonly agreed trends and characteristics about change have emerged. All writers agree that change is a very complex process. Indeed,
it has been suggested that productive educational change roams somewhere between overcontrol and chaos (Pascale, 1990).

Fullan concluded, “the process of educational change in modern society is so complex that the greatest initial need is to comprehend its dynamics” (1991 p. 16).

**Traditional perspectives on change**
Existing literature reviews point to the beginnings of classic research on educational change around the late 1950s and regard the early work of Chin and Benne (1969) as significant (Sashkin & Egermeier, 1992). These same reviews are also helpful in presenting different perspectives (or ways of viewing or considering) change over the years since the 1960s. Diagrammatic models are frequently used to help elaborate these different perspectives.

Many writers who seek to describe the nature of educational change use models to help describe and categorize education change. There is often variation between such models because they are sometimes based on varying assumptions and values about change. Regardless, models remain a helpful aid to describe change characteristics and the process of change generally.

One such model identified three influential perspectives on education change (House, 1981). These three broad perspectives have been summarized as follows (Sashkin & Egermeier, 1993):

- The rational-scientific or R & D perspective position that change is created by dissemination of innovative techniques.
- The political perspective (the top-down approach) bringing about change through legislation and other external directives.
- The cultural perspective (the bottom-up approach) seeking to influence change through encouraging value changes within organizations.
These broad perspectives have been applied to the 30-year history of educational change to help identify major trends. Specifically, the metaphor of “waves of reform” has been used to categorize these three perspectives into a chronology of the history of educational change. This wave metaphor is extremely helpful in putting into perspective the history of the thinking and writing about educational change (Sashkin & Egermeier, 1993).

The first wave in the 1960s and early 1970s centered on the perspective of the rational-scientific or R & D approach. This perspective assumed that people accept and use information that has been scientifically shown to result in educational improvements. However, change has proved to be a much more complex process than this perspective assumed. The failure of the rational-scientific perspective was linked to the fact that people do not necessarily take up new ideas solely on the basis that they will be good for them.

This in turn led to the perspective that if people will not take up new ideas solely because they have been proven to be good for them, then legislation will be enacted which makes it mandatory for people to effect change. So the failure of the rational-scientific approach led in the 1980s to a second wave or perspective on change.

This second wave, known as the political perspective on change, was dominated by strong external policy controls, usually mandated by legislation. Compliance was often accompanied by the threat or otherwise of sanctions and involved compromise among power groups. Again, this perspective failed because people refused to effect change or did so in name only. The failure of the political perspective led to a third wave, known as the cultural perspective on change.
Contemporary perspectives on change

In the 1990s the dominant perspective on educational change has been that of the cultural perspective, which emphasizes changes in meaning and values within the organization undergoing change. This third wave perspective recognizes that to achieve deep and significant change, there needs to be a transformation in the beliefs and values of the organization and that cultures change as a consequence of the actions of leaders who transform their organization (Sashkin & Egermeier, 1992).

Generally, the 1990s has seen renewed interest in the topic of educational change. In particular, some writers have been keen to explain how new ideas spread and what leads people to accept or reject them (Spence, 1994). In the case of educational change, some of its leading writers and researchers have revisited and updated their works on the topic (Fullan, 1991; 1993). Some important new works have also emerged (Hargreaves, Lieberman, Fullan, & Hopkins, 1998).

The study of educational change has come a long way during its 30-year history and there is an emerging consensus among leading writers that change in the 1990s is entering a new phase. Many new analogies are appearing to help describe the nature of change in the 1990s and many of these point to new experiences and new ways of thinking about change. Indeed, it has been suggested that change in the 1990s is representative of a new phase in how we think and act in relation to change. This new phase has been described in terms of being “a quantum leap – a paradigm breakthrough – in how we think about and act in relation to change” (Fullan, 1993).

First and second-order change

The categorization of change prior to the 1990s as “first-order changes” and change in the 1990s as “second-order changes” is a useful one (Sarason, 1990).
Specifically, first-order change seeks to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of what is currently done, without really changing (or disturbing) the basic organizational features. However, second-order change seeks to alter fundamentally the way in which organizations are put together, including new goals, structures and roles. The challenge of change in the 1990s is therefore being seen as the challenge of cultural or second-order change (Fullan, 1991).

The new paradigm of change
With the 30-year history of research about the nature of the change process and the new thinking of the 1990s has come the identification of eight basic lessons about the new paradigm of change (Fullan, 1993). These are summarized in Table 2.1.

These eight lessons stand somewhat in contrast with earlier thinking about educational change, which proposed that successful change needed only to be matched by one of four operational strategies (or some combination of all four) to be successful. These operational strategies have been summarized as:

(1) Fix the parts, which involves improvement by adopting proven innovations of various types.
(2) Fix the people, through training and development.
(3) Fix the school (or organization), by developing the organizations’ capabilities to solve their own problems.
(4) Fix the system, by reforming and restructuring the entire enterprise of education, from the state department of education to the district and the school building (Sashkin & Egermeier, 1993).
Table 2.1: Fullan’s eight basic lessons of the new paradigm of change
(Source: Fullan (1993), p. 21-22)

| Lesson One: | You can’t mandate what matters. (The more complex the change the less you can force it.) |
| Lesson Two: | Change is a journey not a blueprint. (Change is non-linear, loaded with uncertainty and excitement and sometimes perverse.) |
| Lesson Three: | Problems are our friends. (Problems are inevitable and you can’t learn without them.) |
| Lesson Four: | Vision and strategic planning come later. (Premature visions and planning blind.) |
| Lesson Five: | Individualism and Collectivism must have equal power. (There are no-one-sided solutions to isolation and groupthink.) |
| Lesson Six: | Neither Centralization nor Decentralization works. (Both top-down and bottom-up strategies are necessary.) |
| Lesson Seven: | Connection with the wider environment is critical for success. (The best organizations learn externally as well as internally.) |
| Lesson Eight: | Every person is a change agent. (Change is too important to leave to the experts, personal mind set and mastery is the ultimate protection.) |
Change as a three-phase process

Since the late seventies there is a general acceptance that planned educational change, when successful, passes through various stages or phases. Indeed, some earlier writers (Lewin, 1952; Mann & Nuff, 1961) noted that change is a process which progresses through various stages and they used terms such as unfreezing, changing and re-freezing to capture and describe the various stages of change.

Terms such as adoption (or initiation), implementation and institutionalization are now generally used to describe change as a three-phase process. This view of change is a useful way to begin to look at events and activities within a change process. However, in using this approach it is noted that it is not always possible to view events and activities within a change process as discretely self-contained in any one particular phase.

Using the 3-phase analogy has seen the following broad descriptions emerge of each stage:

Phase 1 – initiation, mobilization, or adoption – consists of the process that leads up to and includes a decision to adopt or proceed with a change.

Phase II – implementation or initial use (usually the first two or three years of use) – involves the first experiences of attempting to put an idea or reform into practice.

Phase III – called continuation, incorporation, routinization, or institutionalization – refers to whether the change gets built in as an ongoing part of the system or disappears by way of a decision to discard or through attrition (Fullan, 1991).
The adoption, implementation and institutionalization phases

As the first phase, **adoption** often involves planning and decision-making. Indeed, adoption processes have been described as special kinds of decision-making processes (Van den Ban & Hawkins, 1988).

Various terms have been used to describe the adoption phase. For example, it has been referred to as the planning stage (Miles, 1978), the proposal generation stage (Daft & Becker, 1978), the readiness stage (Rosenblum & Louis, 1981) and mobilization (Berman, 1981). Some of the characteristics suggested of this stage include novelty, complexity and open-endedness (Weick, 1976). However, the conventionally accepted definition of the adoption phase is that it consists of the process that leads up to and includes a decision to adopt or proceed with a change. From the decision to adopt flows implementation.

Accordingly, adoption has to do with decisions made by people. In taking action to accept or begin to use on a regular basis something which appears to be new to the person choosing to adopt, the start of this phase of change is commenced (Spence, 1994).

The **implementation** phase is concerned with the specific actions taken to put an idea or reform into practice in order to effect change. Characteristics of this phase involve complexity and often lots of sub-processes. The innovation generally interacts with its setting and the behavior of people within the setting.

It is generally recognized that **institutionalization** takes place when attempts are made to stabilize the change in state. It is at this stage that the innovation is no longer considered new or novel as it has become accepted as part of the normal practice within the system.
Change as an implementation-dominated process
To date there has been a strong trend towards viewing the implementation phase of the change process as both the most complex and the most difficult stage of the change process. Successful change has tended to be viewed as successful implementation.

The literature about educational change abounds with studies about how change is implemented. This maybe due to an appreciation that the adoption of an innovation does not necessarily lead to change and so researchers have tended to focus on how innovations get implemented and thus how change happens, in the broadest sense. Implementation studies have examined a range of research topics, including barriers to change and the role of the change agent. This implementation-dominated literature pays almost no regard to decisions, events or actions that precede the implementation phase, except from the viewpoint of how implementation has proceeded.

Change as an adoption-dominated process
While the adoption or initiation phase has not been totally ignored, research on this aspect of change is small in comparison to implementation studies. There is some recognition that inflexibility and tightness of definition may play some part in this. For example, it maybe sometimes difficult to identify precisely when the adoption phase has ended and implementation has begun.

Amid the general acceptance of the idea that change moves through various stages and the 1990s recognition of the complex and ubiquitous nature of change as being non-linear, some questions are beginning to emerge about the very early stage of the change process (Fullan, 1991). In particular, Fullan has been asked:

“What do we know about successful initiation; that is what do we know about startups that have a better chance of mobilizing people and resources toward implementation of desired change?” (1991 p. 62).
In this questioning there is beginning to emerge some recognition that the very start of a change process (or the initiation process within the adoption phase) might be significant (Fullan, 1991). The initiation process within the adoption phase has been identified as “what happens by way of mobilization, and planning to prepare for change” (Fullan, 1991). In this context it is not unlike the planning stage earlier identified by Miles (1978).

This notion that start-ups or “beginnings” might be an important component of the change process is almost hinting or alluding to some type of pre-adoption phase and in some ways is returning to the earlier theories of planning to plan for change. The possible identification of a start-up or beginnings component within the adoption phase of the change process might be a factor which convinced some of the notion that vision and strategic planning come later in a change process (Fullan, 1992; 1993).

Some writers contend that an essential part of successful change is that a vision is created, communicated, has commitment to it established and people then organized to align their work to the vision (Beckhard & Pritchard, 1992). The opposing view contends two important considerations. Firstly, that time and reflection is need before a plausible vision emerges and that such a vision must precede any action for change. Secondly, that for the vision to be successful it must be shared (Fullan, 1992). If one accepts this opposing view then there is support for the notion that premature vision and planning can blind and therefore, vision and strategic planning come later.

**Shared vision**
Within any change process the development of a vision for the future is an important component. Visioning is about imagining some future desired state to be achieved and is an integral part of any strategic planning process.
The idea of a *shared* vision conveys the notion of ownership and commitment and brings into focus interactions and engagements between individuals that involve a complex array of communication processes and which necessarily question fundamental values, beliefs and behaviors. Shared vision has been defined as a vision that many people are truly committed to, because it reflects their own personal vision (Senge, 1990).

Vision is one of Fullan’s eight basic lessons of the new paradigm of change which were presented in Table 2.1 (Fullan, 1993). Lesson four proposes that vision and strategic planning come later and that premature visions and planning blind. This approach contends that two elements are necessary for the development of a shared vision. The first element is time and reflective experience and the other is interaction between the leaders and the organizational members (Fullan, 1992). Accordingly, the development of a shared vision emerges from various events and activities which take place in an organizational context over time and which involve reflection and interaction between the leaders and organizational members.

Indeed this approach emphasizes not so much the importance of the vision but rather *how* the vision is shaped. Therefore, not only the content of the vision is important but what events and activities are used to help shape the vision. In this context, rather than becoming overly involved in the technical pattern of strategic planning, it is often best to adopt the “ready, fire, aim” sequence of activity (Fullan, 1993).

In this sequence, ready equates with some broad direction; fire with action and inquiry where skills, clarity and learning are developed; and aim is associated with crystallizing new beliefs, formulating vision and mission statements and focusing on strategic planning. This ready, fire, aim sequence is in contrast
with the more technical pattern of strategic planning which would put the sequence in its more traditionally-accepted sequence of preparing for planning, formulating the vision and then taking some action to implement the vision (or ready, aim, fire).

Visions are often nothing more than mere words on paper or “superficial talk rather than grounded inquiry” (Fullan, 1993) and can sometimes fail. Visions sometimes fail because in the first place too many people are involved or leaders fail to advocate their views.

Communication
At the heart of any change process is the need to gain commitment to change from others, as this is what a shared vision is about. Sharing must involve personal interactions, association between and among individuals and communication. Indeed, some have suggested that effective communication is at the very centre of managing strategic innovation and change (Spence, 1994).

Communication in any change process is important because it not only informs those directly involved about key events and activities but it also serves to help engage and enthuse participants in the change process.

The new and emerging communications and information technologies so readily available to organizations in the 1990s have added new complexities to traditional forms of communication within organizations.

The wider environment
Organizations do not exist in isolation and the global realities of the 1990s mean that factors well beyond the immediate confines or boundaries of the organization frequently play a significant role in any change process. Often these environmental factors are well beyond the scope or control of those
experiencing change and there is often no consensus about what such factors might mean. This is because environmental influences are frequently driven by much wider political, economic, social and/or technological factors. Understanding the wider environment or “learning externally as well as internally” is lesson seven in Fullan’s eight basic lessons of the new paradigm of change, as presented in Table 2.1 (Fullan, 1993).

**Summary**
The review of the literature about educational innovation and change highlights the different perspectives that have emerged over the years about the way that change within educational settings has been viewed. It also serves to highlight the range and complexity of factors likely to impact on any particular change process. Organizational change, which is associated with deep cultural change designed to bring about a transformation in the beliefs and values of an organization, is underpinned by a vast array and complexity of factors.

**LITERATURE REVIEW - ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY**

**Overview**
Some aspects of the literature on organizational theory are relevant to the study in that change takes place in a setting and frequently the boundaries of the setting for change is based around an organization (for example, a school, a university or a library). In addition, innovations are often concerned to achieve organizational change.

The literature of recent organizational theory is also especially pertinent as the dynamics and complexity of change in the 1990s often threaten traditional organizational and management practices. This trend of the 1990s has frequently led organizations to question and clarify their missions, visions, and values (Senge & Sterman, 1992). In the 1990s organizations seeking to effect
change, improvement or transformation are focusing on their organizational culture and seeing it as a means to effect change.

As with the literature about educational innovation and change, organizational theory has evolved over time and moved through different perspectives. These perspectives reflect contemporary thinking at different historical periods.

**Early perspectives on organizational theory**

Existing literature reviews mark the beginning of research on organizations at around the turn of the century and note the early work of Weber (1947), Taylor (1947) and Fayol (1949) as influential (Dellar, 1990). As with educational change, significant trends in the thinking, writing and research about organizational theory over the years have also been identified.

Broadly, three perspectives on organizational theory have emerged and these are known as the classical organizational theory, the human relations approach and the systems perspective.

Rapid industrial change at the turn of the century saw the emergence of classical organizational theory. This perspective viewed organizations as bureaucratic structures that operated with defined controls and worked to achieve well-defined organizational goals. Some of the defining characteristics of these bureaucratic organizations were the concentration of power and authority in a top few positions, the use of scientific procedures to determine the best way to undertake tasks, and rules and regulations which prescribed the way work was to be done. Change in this perspective was often undertaken solely to improve efficiency and effectiveness of production - and workers within organizations were viewed as objects or merely as part of the bureaucratic machine.
During the 1920s a second perspective on organizations emerged which had its basis in studies of worker productivity undertaken by Mayo (1945) (Dellar, 1990). Known as the Hawthorne studies, they sought to establish any scientific principles that would lead to greater worker efficiency. Fundamental to this perspective is the view that workers could control the production process, independent of the demands of management. It was evident from this perspective that the interest of workers need not coincide with the interests of management and that conflict could often be the outcome. Accordingly, in the human relations perspective much attention was focused on reducing conflict or potential for conflict between workers and management and improving worker motivation and morale.

Behavioral scientists have been influential in the third perspective on organizations. In the post-World War Two perspective on organizations, the focus has been on work behavior in formal organizations. This perspective has combined both the classical and human relations perspectives on organizational theory (Dellar, 1990). Behavioral scientists tend to view organizations as social systems that interact with, and are dependent upon, their environment.

In the systems perspective, the system is a set of interdependent elements forming an organized whole. There are a range of interrelated social interactions, and formal structures aid in the achievement of specific organizational goals. In this perspective too, the behavior of individuals within the organization is viewed as purposeful, disciplined and rational. Change in this perspective often relates to the development of clear organizational policies and an emphasis on supervisory styles. Change in this perspective often revolved around the role of supervisors and the development of management models, such as management by objectives (MBO).
Perspectives on organizations in the 1990s

The literature about organizations in the 1990s abounds with references to the volatile nature of organizations and the enormous pressures which various forms of change are having on organizations. The literature also shows a new trend in organizational theory concerning the concept of “the learning organization” and there is evidence to suggest that developments within libraries during the 1990s reflected this trend (Pattison & Williamson, 1992; 1993).

Learning organizations have been defined as places “where people continually expand their capacity to create the results they truly deserve, where new and expansive patterns of thinking are nurtured, where collective aspiration is set free, and where people are continually learning how to learn together” (Senge, 1990). To achieve a learning organization, Senge suggests the use of five “component technologies”: systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning.

What is important about this contribution to organizational theory and to the context of this study is the way in which this approach shows clearly how the learning organization approaches change or its capacity to handle change. In fact, “nowhere are the differences between the learning organization and its knowing, understanding, and thinking antecedents more evident than in their approach to change” (McGill & Slocum, 1993).

The learning organization is committed to continuous improvement and it experiments and learns from the experience. It frequently has a great deal of change underway and hence the organization’s approach to change is one of acceptance of change as the normal state of affairs because it is the change itself that leads to learning.
Matching organization perspectives with approaches to change

With these perspectives from organizational theory as background, an extremely clear, concise and very useful categorization of organizational types and characteristics has been developed (McGill & Slocum, 1993). The “organizational approaches to experience” grid identifies four types of organizations and they are the knowing organization, the understanding organization, the thinking organization and the learning organization.

It is possible to adapt the grid to cross-match both the traditional organizational perspectives and the categorisation approach to help show the development of thinking, writing and research over time. This matching alignment, including the specific characteristics for each category, appears in Table 2.2.

The important element in this combined approach is to show how clearly the different perspectives and categories of organizations deal with change or their capacity to handle change. For example, for the knowing organization change is incremental, must be a fine-tuning of “the best way”; while in the learning organization change is part of the continuous process of experience-examine-hypothesize-experiment-experience.

The adaption involves the following:

- Using the organizational types and characteristics of the organizational approaches to experience grid, and adding to the grid the traditional organizational perspectives (that is, Classical; Human Relations; Systems and the Learning Organization).
Table 2.2: Matching organizational perspectives with organizational categorization
(Adapted from the organizational approaches to experiences grid, (McGill & Slocum, 1993)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TOWARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowing</strong> (Classical Organization)</td>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong> (Human Relations Organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>Dedication to the one best way: Predictable, Controlled, Efficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT PRACTICES</td>
<td>Maintain control through rules and regulations, “by the book.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>Follow the rules, don’t ask why.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTOMERS</td>
<td>Must believe the company knows best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>Incremental, must be a fine tuning of “the best way.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Culture in organizations

Within organizational theory there is a growing range of literature devoted to organizational culture. The business literature applies the concept of culture to corporations while educational research is also available on aspects of classroom climate and the organizational culture of schools. Indeed some writers have suggested that schools, and by association other types of educational institutions, have a particular type of culture (Deal, 1987).

Definitions about culture in an organizational context vary somewhat but it is generally accepted that the term organizational culture relates to how things are done in an organization or “the way we do things around here” (Deal, 1987). Other more formalized definitions see culture in terms of a social dimension. This approach regards organizational culture as the social and phenomenological uniqueness of a particular community – be it a hospital, a bakery or a school – and which comprises numerous intangible and symbolic elements (such as values, philosophies and ideologies) as well as those which are more tangible, and are given behavioral and visual expression (Beare, Caldwell, & Milikan, 1989).

There is also general agreement about organizational culture being associated with both tangible and intangible elements, some of which are sometimes exemplified through symbols. It has been suggested that tangible cultural forms embody or represent the ways of an organization. Shared values, heroes, rituals, ceremonies, stories and cultural networks have been identified as examples of the tangible symbols (Deal, 1987). Intangible embodiments have to do with particular behaviors, which might become obvious through things such as the underlying philosophy espoused by the leader and members and/or the ways in which that philosophy is translated into an operational mission or purpose (Beare et al., 1989).
While there are many dimensions to the notion of organizational culture, an important one which impacts on this study is that as change comes it has some impact on the culture of an organization. Indeed as organizations respond to the pressures of the 1990s (such as explosive technology, political and environmental change and globalization) and begin to think about and clarify their missions, visions and values, this questioning often threatens traditional habits, norms and assumptions. It has been suggested that the more profound the change, the deeper must be the thinking about mission, vision and values (Senge & Sterman, 1992).

This is so because culture is learned and because people within organizations develop attachments to the culture, especially to the tangible representations of the culture, which frequently reinforce and entrench the culture. Therefore, “when change alters or breaks the attachment, meaning is questioned” (Deal, 1987).

Culture in its widest consideration has both potential and power within organizations (Beare et al., 1989). Any attempt, planned or otherwise, to alter the culture of an organization is therefore either attempting to alter power within the organization or to find new potential to establish new ways of doing things.

LITERATURE REVIEW - STRATEGIC PLANNING

Overview
The literature on strategic planning has its origins outside of the education domain having come originally from the military environment. “Strategy is derived from “strategos” – meaning a general (Riggs, 1984). The word “strategic” is derived from the word strategy meaning the art of war, especially the planning of movements of troops, ships etc into favourable positions. More
recently, following the use of the word in a business context it has also come to be linked with a plan using skill in business and politics (Sykes, 1978).

From its military origins, strategic planning was embraced by the business and commercial world. Accordingly, within the business literature, writing (if not research) on the topic of strategic planning is expansive and it is frequently linked to the adoption of a corporate managerial approach to the management of organizations.

Strategic planning in relation to educational institutions has a more recent history. Indeed, Australian universities were somewhat slow to adopt strategic planning processes. Many institutions only did so when, in the mid-1990s, it became a requirement as part of the quality audits conducted by the Federal Government. It was also around this time that as part of profile discussions between individual universities and the federal Department of Employment, Education and Training, universities were required to link their funding requests to institutional plans and profiles. Strategic plans in these contexts were often only administrative documents produced at the time of a quality audit or profile visit and were not designed to shape the real activities of universities.

In the major indexing and abstracting service for educational literature, ERIC, the term “strategic planning” is also inclusive of the term “strategic management”. It first appeared as an ERIC subject heading as recently as 1993 and was defined as “a process of continuous planning for change, which assesses an organization’s or program’s internal and external environment, analyzes the implications of relevant trends, and identifies effective strategies for achieving a desired future state” (Houston, 1995).

Nevertheless, the term strategic planning was in use in educational literature well before 1993, having first appeared in the early 1980s.
Strategic planning in libraries

In relation to strategic planning in the educational setting of academic libraries, a prominent early author and recognized industry authority on strategic planning in academic libraries is Donald E. Riggs (1982). Riggs, who was Director of University Libraries at the Arizona State University (ASU) during the early 1980s, was one of the first library managers to apply the principles of strategic planning to the professional practice of a large academic library. His early writing and his work at ASU became the centre of his major writing on the topic (1984). Riggs continues to influence the literature (1988a; 1988b; 1988c) (Gothberg & Riggs, 1988) (Riggs, 1989; 1992a; 1992b) (Riggs & Sykes, 1993) (Riggs, 1993; 1997a; 1997b). His writings and professional practice tend to mirror current business thinking and perspectives on organizational theory and there is an obvious trend in his writing that reflects this. For example, his 1980s writings are very much in the style of the organization as a system (identify and isolate the problem, collect data, implement solutions) and is about management practices and topics such as time management (Gothberg & Riggs, 1988). His latest published work also reflects current thinking about organizations as learning organization and is focused on how to make the library a learning organization (Riggs, 1997a). Riggs is also well cited by other authors on the subject of strategic planning in libraries during the latter half of the 1980s and 1990s.

It was noted in the 1980s that the deliberate practice of strategic planning in libraries was regrettably slow in being adopted and rudimentary, despite its wide recognition in the corporate world (Riggs, 1984). However, during the second half of the 1980s, the concept of strategic planning in libraries began to emerge in a small number of articles in the literature about Australian librarianship. These reports largely centre on a discussion of models of strategic planning and the use of library service surveys to inform the strategic planning process. For
example, one of the earliest cases reported was about the use of strategic planning concepts to assist with the development of the library building and services at the new Parliament House complex in Canberra (Brudenall, 1985). Other cases reported around this time included the use of strategic planning concepts in an academic library (Wainwright, 1987) and a medical library (Virgo, 1987).

By the mid-1990s, the literature has many examples of strategic planning in academic libraries. Indeed, it has been suggested that Australian university libraries have quickly developed sophisticated approaches to strategic planning and client focused performance and its measurement, often ahead of their parent communities (Bundy, 1997). Many of the examples appearing in literature during this period are grounded in the philosophy of corporate managerialism and the need for change management. At this time also, public relations begins to emerge as a core part of the strategic planning cycle. During the first half of the 1990s the emphasis is on flexibility in strategic planning and the use of technology to assist the process. It also becomes linked to performance, whether this is performance-based reward, or performance measurement and review.

In the library literature during the latter half of the 1990s the term strategic planning becomes mixed with Total Quality Management (TQM) and Total Quality Service (TQS). Particular examples of the application of strategic planning in libraries become common in the literature. There is an increased emphasis on a participatory model of strategic planning and the focus is often on the use of teams and group decision making as a tool in strategic planning.

In relation to strategic planning and libraries, a review of the research available through Dissertation Abstracts found the earliest occurrence of a master or
doctoral thesis that included the term strategic planning in academic libraries was in 1986 (Bingham, 1986; Neuman, 1986).

The Riggs approach to strategic planning for libraries
Regardless of the broad and/or specific context in which planning takes place, there is widespread recognition that the process of strategic planning involves some key elements or sub-processes. In particular, a library’s strategic planning process encompasses its mission statement, goals, objective, strategies, alternatives and contingencies, policies, and resource allocations, and their implementation and evaluation. Particular emphasis is placed on the interrelationship of these components and on the formulation and implementation of strategies. One purpose of strategic planning is to determine future areas of activity and decide future courses of action that will result in a high degree of achievement of the library’s goals and objectives (Riggs, 1984).

While accepting the technical components of a strategic planning process for libraries, it has also been recognized and appreciated that strategic planning involves a people dimension. This people dimension involves complexities, risk and is concerned with power and politics (Riggs, 1984). The Riggs formula for strategic planning for libraries meant that it was not a bottom-up process or something that the director could delegate to a committee. In the view of Riggs, “since the director is responsible for providing leadership and creating the grand design (including the formulation and execution of strategies) for the library, strategic planning is essentially a top-down process” (Riggs, 1984).
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Overview
Bringing together a broad range of ideas from the educational literature and research on innovation and change and organizational theory helps to identify a range of complex and interrelated factors likely to impact on any planned change process designed to effect fundamental change in professional practice within an educational setting. It also helps to conceptualize a generic framework through which to view the various component parts of a change process, which is triggered by the introduction of an innovation.

Including or viewing strategic planning as an innovation can develop the framework further. Overlaying on this framework some of the technical features of a strategic planning process, as both an educational innovation and an enabler or driver of change, further contributes to the framework as an aid to understanding change.

Description and assumptions underpinning the framework
The generic innovation and change framework is presented in Table 2.3 in general terms as an aid through which to view the complexity of a change process, which takes as its trigger for change the introduction of some form of innovation.

The innovation and change framework is based on some assumptions derived from the literature and is firmly and unequivocally centred in the domain of educational theory and practice. In particular, the framework is underpinned by the assumptions that change:

- is a process.
- takes place over time.
- is influenced by environmental factors.
- involves the development of a shared vision.
- involves the complexities of human interaction and communication.
- moves through three major phases of adoption (or initiation), implementation and institutionalization.
- involves sub-phases within each of the three major phases.
- involves a formal (tangible) organizational dimension (represented by philosophy, management practices, employees, customers and the capacity to cope with change).
- involves an informal (intangible) organizational dimension (represented by personal beliefs, values and behaviors).
### Table 2.3: The generic innovation and change framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TOWARD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowing</strong> (Classical Organization)</td>
<td><strong>Understanding</strong> (Human Relations Organization)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Dedication to the one best way:  
  - Predictable  
  - Controlled  
  - Efficient | Dedication to strong cultural values which guide strategy and action. Belief in the “ruling myth”. | A view of business as a series of problems.  
If it’s broke, fix it fast. | Examine, enhance and improve every business experience, including how we experience. |
| MANAGEMENT PRACTICES | MANAGEMENT PRACTICES | MANAGEMENT PRACTICES | MANAGEMENT PRACTICES |
| Maintain control through rules and regulations, “by the book”. | Clarify, communicate, reinforce the company culture. | Identify and isolate problems, collect data, implement solutions. | Encourage experiments, facilitate examination, promote constructive dissent, model learning and acknowledge failures. |
| EMPLOYEES | EMPLOYEES | EMPLOYEES | EMPLOYEES |
| Follow the rules, don’t ask why. | Use corporate values as guides to behavior. | Enthusiastically embrace and enact programmed solutions. | Gather and use information; constructively dissent. |
| CUSTOMERS | CUSTOMERS | CUSTOMERS | CUSTOMERS |
| Must believe the company knows best. | Believe company values ensure a positive experience. | Are considered a problem to be solved. | Are part of a teaching/learning relationship, with open, continuous dialogue. |
| CHANGE | CHANGE | CHANGE | CHANGE |
| Incremental, must be a fine tuning of “the best way”. | Only within the “ruling myth”. | Implemented through problem-solving programs, which are seen as panaceas. | Parts of the continuous process of experience-examine-hypothesize-experiment-experience. |

**Characteristics of the context of change**
- Settings/Scenes
- Actors
- Scenarios
- Issues
- Actions

**Other factors influencing change**
- Shared vision
- Communication
- Wider environment
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Dimensions of the innovation and change framework

The innovation and change framework views change from three dimensions as follows:

- The organizational dimension.
- The characteristics of the context of change dimension.
- Other factors influencing change dimension.

Firstly, the organizational (or horizontal) dimension of the innovation and change framework helps to gauge the broad nature and extent of change along a continuum from a knowing (or classical) organization towards that of the learning organization. Looked at more specifically through the professional practices (or vertical) dimension, the change can be gauged in terms of the organization’s philosophy, management practices, employees, customers and the capacity to handle change.

Secondly, the innovation and change framework takes account of the characteristics of the context of change, which may influence the nature and extent of change process. In particular, the following factors associated with the context of change may influence change process:

- general setting (such as universities) and the specific scene (such as a department within the university).
- the actors (or people) involved.
- the various scenarios (or options) available and the choices made between them.
- the issues that emerge.
- various actions undertaken to effect the change.

The setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions collectively constitute a way of examining the dynamics of the change process. This dimension of the innovation and change framework helps to “unpack” the change process and to
establish relationships between the various contextual variables of the process. In particular, it helps to examine the context of the location (setting/scene), the people (actors), the options (scenarios), the issues and the actions taken to affect and advance the change process.

Finally, to highlight the complexity of change, there may be other factors influencing change. In particular, shared vision, communication and the wider environment may exert an influence during the various stages of adoption, implementation and institutionalization of the innovation.

The impact or influence of both the characteristics of the context of change and the other factors influencing change is represented through the use of the arrows underneath the organizational and professional practice dimensions of the innovation and change framework.

**Description of the framework in terms of the LIS case**

The innovation and change framework can be further specified and tailored to fit specific types of innovations and the special characteristics of any particular change process. For example, the case of the LIS strategic planning process can be conceptualized using the innovation and change framework.

In particular, from the organizational (or horizontal) dimension of the framework, where was the LIS staff seeking to be along the continuum from knowledge towards learning organization, as a result of the strategic planning process? Secondly, from the professional practices (or vertical) dimension what was the extent and nature of the desired change to be effected to the LIS philosophy, management practices, employees, customers and capacity to handle change, through the strategic planning process?
In the LIS case how did the characteristics of the context of the change impact on the nature and extent of change? In particular, the strategic planning process was influenced by the general setting of the Curtin University of Technology and higher education, as well as the specific scene of the LIS and the world of libraries. Various actors, such as the University Librarian, consultants, Decision Conference participants and other LIS staff were involved. In organizational terms the LIS staff had to choose which scenarios they preferred to move towards. LIS staff identified various issues in the course of determining their vision. Finally, LIS staff initiated specific actions to effect the change.

Other factors, such a shared vision, communication and the wider environment may also have influenced the LIS staff in the adoption of the innovation of strategic planning.

Using the innovation and change framework helps to systematically examine and unpack the LIS strategic planning process, especially in terms of the specific research questions underpinning the study. In particular, the framework helps to view the LIS strategic planning process from two levels – as an innovation and as a driver of change.

Considering the innovation of strategic planning within the context of the innovation and change framework helps to unpack and understand the nature of the educational innovation and the change then experienced by the LIS staff. It also helps to highlight common features that influence success especially in the initiation processes within the adoption phase of the change process.

Firstly, the strategic planning process is viewed as the driver of change in the LIS as an organization. From this organizational dimension, the study looks over the strategic planning process (the events and activities) to see how strategic planning was used to drive change, and move LIS from a knowing (or
classical) organization towards that of the learning organization. These events and activities are described in detail in Chapter 4.

Secondly, the strategic planning process is viewed as an educational innovation in its own right. For the LIS staff, the strategic planning process was something that they perceived to be new and which they appreciated was begun in order to trigger a change in their professional practice. From this professional practices dimension, the study looks into the strategic planning process to see the nature and extent of change that was projected by LIS staff in terms of philosophy, management practices, employees, customers and capacity to handle change.

The component parts of the innovation and change framework are used to analyze the LIS case and the findings from this analysis are reported in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes in detail the methodology used in the study. Specifically, it presents a rationale for the adoption of a particular research approach namely case study. It then defines the particular case under examination and discusses how the method for data collection was determined. This chapter concludes by describing the procedures employed for organizing and analyzing these data to build the case.

RESEARCH APPROACH

Qualitative research
The study examines the particular phenomenon of strategic planning in order to gain insight, foster discovery, help interpretation and build educational theory about innovation and change in professional practice. Given the nature of the research focus and the specific research questions, a qualitative method was deemed to be more appropriate than a quantitative approach, which is usually best suited to studies concerned with hypothesis testing.

Qualitative research in education is an umbrella concept covering several forms of inquiry that helps to explain the meaning of social phenomena with as little disruption to the natural setting as possible (Merriam, 1992). While research within the qualitative paradigm may range over different topics and utilize various methods, some common characteristics have been identified for qualitative studies and these are evident in this study.

In particular, the study demonstrates the following features usually associated with qualitative research (Gall et al., 1996). The study is concerned to gain insight into a particular phenomenon from the participants’ perspective and the
researcher is the primary instrument for data collection and analysis. The study employs an inductive research strategy in that it builds abstractions, concepts and theories rather than testing existing theory, and the research findings from the study are in the form of themes and categories. The study is richly descriptive and focuses on process, meaning and understanding and requires the researcher to get close to the natural setting of the study.

**Case study**
The element of getting close to the natural setting led to development of the study as a case study. That is, the study is concerned to examine a particular instance (or case) of the phenomenon. Indeed, qualitative research is sometimes called case study research (Gall et al., 1996). Educational literature over the last 30 years or so contains a prevalence of qualitative case studies and it is generally accepted that case study research is the most widely used approach to qualitative inquiry in education. Case study researchers collect intensive data about particular instances of a phenomenon and seek to understand each instance on its own terms and in its own context (Gall et al., 1996). This study uses the particular experiences of one case to gain an insight into the factors that contribute to successful innovation and change.

The case studies reported in the educational literature range over a variety of settings, focus on many different research themes and employ a diverse range of methods for data collection and data analysis. Despite the widespread use of the case study approach some confusion remains about the precise nature of this type of research.

Some of the confusion comes from the terminology. Some writers refer to case studies in terms of the process of conducting the research while others refer to the unit of study (Merriam, 1992). Nevertheless, if, as suggested by Merriam (1992), the single most defining characteristic of case study research lies in
delimiting the object of study or the case, then this study of the experience of the LIS staff with innovation and change through strategic planning qualifies as a case study. This is because the case under investigation is a single entity that is bounded around the experiences of the LIS staff with their strategic planning process.

Case studies generally display four characteristics (Gall et al., 1996) and these are evident in this study. Case studies mostly focus on a specific instance or instances (the case or cases), provide in-depth research of the case, are set in natural contexts, and show the perspective of the participants. Taking these characteristics and applying them to the case study of the LIS staff experiences with their strategic planning process, it is possible to highlight these four characteristics as they are exhibited in the study. For example, the study focuses on a specific instance of the case of the LIS staff experiences with their strategic planning process. It also provides an in-depth analysis of the case in its natural context of the world of the LIS in particular, libraries in general, the University and higher education more broadly. Furthermore, the study shows the perspective of the case through those LIS staff participating in it.

Case studies as such do not lay claim to any particular method of data collection or data analysis (Merriam, 1992) and even a general overview of published case studies serves to highlight the range and diversity of data collection and data analysis used by various researchers.

**Historical studies**

In addition to laying claim to be a qualitative case study, this study also has elements of historical research and therefore can be described as an historical case study. It has been noted that in educational research, historical research and case study research often merge (Merriam, 1992) and this is so in respect to
the study. In this study, the historical nature of the case study derives from two sources.

Firstly, the study seeks to answer questions about a past phenomenon for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of present educational issues and is therefore set in the timeframe of 1992 to 1993. Secondly, the study uses data that was created at the time of the events by the participants in the LIS strategic planning process. While the data is analyzed retrospectively, it is not created retrospectively. From this perspective the data for the study was created before it was decided to study the phenomenon and as such the researcher assembles rather than creates the data. The study relies on archival records as the primary source of data, an approach more traditionally found in historical research than in case studies. Indeed, it has been noted that an occasional qualitative study has been undertaken using documents alone (such as written materials or photographs), but these are the exceptions (Merriam, 1992).

**Definition of the case**

Defining the case or unit of analysis for the study is important because it helps to limit the data collection and the data analysis (Yin, 1994). In this study the case is defined and limited by factors related to the both the organizational setting and the timeframe. In particular, the study is concerned only with the experiences of innovation and change through the strategic planning process used by the LIS staff at Curtin over the timeframe of 1992 to 1993.

**DATA COLLECTION AND PROCESSING**

**Data collection techniques**

The collection of data for a case study could potentially have come from a number of sources and these have been identified as documents, archival records, interviews, direct observation, participant-observation, and physical
artefacts (Yin, 1993). However, because this case involved a retrospective analysis of the phenomenon and the decision to study the events was taken sometime after the events themselves had taken place, the use of some data collection techniques was impractical. For example, direct observation and participant-observation were not possible.

The use of interviews either conducted one-on-one or through a structured questionnaire as a source of data collection was also rejected because of the researcher’s relationship to the setting and the phenomenon under investigation. The researcher had been a key participant in the LIS strategic planning process by virtue of her position as the leader of the LIS strategic planning process during the period under investigation. In these circumstances, it was felt that the use of interviews or questionnaires was inappropriate. In particular, given that the researcher still had a leadership position within the LIS, it was felt that these techniques had the potential to be viewed as somewhat threatening by the other LIS staff involved in the strategic planning process. It was felt that responses to either an interview or questionnaire could compromise the integrity and credibility of the data, since LIS staff might be inclined to frame their responses in terms of what they thought the researcher wanted them to say. In these circumstances it would be difficult for the respondents to differentiate between the roles of researcher and leader.

This left the approach of using documentary material or archival records as the sole source of data collection for the study. Using such material in qualitative research is not much different from using interviews or observations (Merriam, 1992). In his discussion of case studies, Yin (1994) has distinguished between documentation and archival records as a source of evidence. While he has not given a precise definition to differentiate between the two forms of evidence, he cites examples of documentation as letters, memoranda, communiques, agendas, minutes of meetings, internal proposals and even newspaper clippings and other
articles appearing in the media. He makes no distinction between published and unpublished sources. Yin (1994) also avoids a definition of archival records but again alludes to a definition by citing example of archival records to include: organizational records, survey data, personal diaries, calendars and telephone listings. However, he indicates that archival records are often in computerised form. This discussion, and especially the distinction between documentation and archival records as a source of data collection, is not helpful in the context of this study.

A more useful discussion about the use of archival records as a source of data collection for a case study is provided by Gall et al. (1996). They define documents as written communications that are prepared for personal rather than official purposes and archival records as written communications that have an official purpose. In the context of this study archival records, which might include some documents, are used as the sole source of data collection for the study. However, unless documents have been added to the organizational files by their author or authors, then it is impossible for the researcher to tell the difference between documents and archival records. Therefore, in the context of this study the archival records may include some documents as defined by Gall et al. (1996).

The merging of case study and historical research approaches and the decision to use archival records as the sole source for data collection for the study provided some complexities that in turn influenced the conduct of the research. For example, using archival records as the primary source of data collection provided a rich source of data for the study. However, trying to analyze records retrospectively requires a consideration of the context in which the written communication was produced. This could be influenced by factors such as the author’s purpose in writing it; the author’s intended audience and the audience purpose in reading it. In turn, the researcher must also appreciate that in reading
and analyzing the records she is also creating her own meaning and view of events.

Research involving the use of archival records of an organization, especially historical records, normally involves the use of an official archive or archival repository. Such facilities collect, store, preserve and make available the official records of an organization and designated professional staff usually manages them. In organizations, like universities, the responsibility for managing the archival records of the organization many rest with a central department (such as the records department, the university archives or the university library) or be devolved to individual departments across the organization. Whichever approach is in place it is usual for the official records of an organization to be the subject of organizational policy and administrative procedures.

A major difficulty at the data collection phase of the study was to physically locate the archival records of the LIS. This was a difficulty because at Curtin University of Technology, during the timeframe of the study, there was no official record management policy and/or procedures, and individual schools and areas, such as the LIS, were left to determine their own policy and procedures. At the time under examination in this study, the University did not have an institutional archive and the university library was not responsible for the official records of the university. There was a central records department but its role was to manage the official records of the Vice-Chancellor and University Council and not those of the whole of the University.

Given that the case under investigation involved the LIS staff, who themselves were information management professionals, it could have been expected that the official LIS records would be well organized, according to accepted standards of professional practice. However, this was not the case. The LIS did not operate a centralized facility for all LIS records and there was no internal
LIS policy or procedures to regulate the administration of the official LIS records. Just as the institution of Curtin University of Technology devolved responsibility, so too did the LIS.

This is not to say, however, that there were no official LIS corporate records for the period, as there were. However, their storage and organization was in disarray and it took some time to locate physically the corporate records relevant to the period of the study.

Accessing the data
In studies that involve the use of an institutional archive run by professional staff using industry protocols and standards, the approach to finding historical information relevant to the study is usually relatively straightforward. The process of registering at the archive, using finding aids and recording information is well documented both in individual published studies and general texts (Hill, 1993). This is also the case when studies use archival records for data collection when they are held within organizations that have used industry standards to help organize their archival records. However, this is not the case in the context of this study.

In order to begin data analysis, it was first necessary to gain official permission to use the LIS corporate records. Accordingly, official permission to access and use the LIS corporate records was first sought from the executive manager within the University with overall responsibility for the LIS. Appendix 1 contains the relevant documentation.

Locating the data
Some investigation was undertaken to determine how documents were created, processed and stored within LIS during the period of the strategic planning process under examination. This involved speaking with any current LIS staff
who had work experience in the library’s administration section, the work group which had responsibility for housing and managing the LIS corporate records. These discussions included conversations with several staff members, including one who had held the position of University Librarian’s Secretary in the closing years of G. G. Allen’s tenure. This staff member had joined the staff in 1988 and transferred from the position of University Librarian’s Secretary towards the end of 1992. She had therefore experienced the closing years of Allen’s tenure, overseen Allen’s departure from the position and office of University Librarian, the arrival of the new University Librarian and the commencement of the strategic planning process. This investigation revealed some very useful information, which raised some methodological and ethical issues for the researcher.

Firstly, for the period under examination in the study, the LIS did not have a structured or standard procedure for the creation, retention and archiving of official corporate records. This meant that while there were individual documents, such as internal memos, reports and correspondence, there was no predetermined or documented file structure to aid their retention or retrieval. It was established, however, that the official records, such as they were, were physically housed in the administration section of the T. L. Robertson Library building and mostly contained documents generated from the Office of the University Librarian.

Secondly, during the early 1990s LIS used a highly devolved system of document creation and this meant that individual LIS staff mostly authored and word processed their own documents. The exception was for the University Librarian who had secretarial staff who assisted with the keyboarding and final production of documents. With this exception, LIS staff were largely responsible for the storage of the document they authored. However, if in an author’s opinion, a document was important enough to be filed on the LIS
corporate records, then it was the author’s responsibility to provide a copy for filing onto the corporate records in the administration section. Any staff requiring documents to be filed onto the LIS corporate records generally provided a copy to the University Librarian’s Secretary who was then responsible for the physical filing of documents.

During the early 1990s several people had held the position of Secretary to the University Librarian and therefore several people had been responsible for the physical creation of files and the filing of documents. In addition to there being no structured or standard procedure for the creation of documents, there was also no standard procedure or thesaurus for file creation or document filing. The common practice was for the University Librarian’s Secretary to file documents in date order, sometimes in broad subject categories. Sometimes the filing categories corresponded to the section of the library where the document had originated. For example, documents created by cataloguing staff were generally filed under the cataloguing section. This categorization therefore did not always correspond with the subject of the document.

Thirdly, a decision was made by the LIS in late 1991 to disband its centralized word-processing unit and devolve the responsibility for document creation and retention to the originator (or author) of the document. This decision complicated the process as it removed a central practice of ensuring that copies of all documents created in the word-processing unit were made and passed for filing. This complicated the process when some years later trying to locate all documents on the LIS corporate records relevant to the study.

Fourthly, during the course of the LIS strategic planning process under examination, several different approaches to document creation were in operation, including different types of computing hardware and software. For example, Wang, Macintosh and PC platforms were used at various stages. Early
on in the study, again through discussions with relevant LIS staff members, it was established that there were some old electronic word processing files lodged on the server, which potentially could be relevant to the study. Unfortunately, these files were lost when the computer server crashed in June 1999, before the researcher had time to establish the usefulness or otherwise of these electronic files.

Finally, it emerged that it was common practice of the administration section staff to remove files from the record area to a secondary storage location at the end of each year. This practice had developed because space in the area was very limited with only five three-draw filing cabinets being available to house working files. The practice had also developed, as one staff member commented, because “no-one ever asked to see last year’s files, anyway”. Apparently, “files were never discarded because they were University property and besides clerical staff do no have the authority to throw things out”. Instead, the practice was to pack the files into archive boxes and then store the boxes in locked areas underneath stairwells throughout the seven stories of the T. L. Robertson Library building. Accordingly, it was necessary for the researcher to search the T. L. Robertson Library building to locate physically the boxes of the archived or discarded corporate records.

In this process, a chance visit by the researcher to the Library’s Closed Collection, which houses the thesis collection and rare and special items also located five boxes which contained files kept by the R & D Librarian. This position had been abolished in 1995 and some of the files previously kept by the incumbent were apparently moved to the Closed Collection when the staff member left the employment of the University. The R & D Librarian had had a close involvement in the strategic planning process, especially during some of the initial planning events and activities, and had kept detailed files over the period 1992-1994. It was eventually established that much of the content of
these files overlapped with those files kept by the administration section. Nevertheless, they did contain some useful “in context” documents, which were lacking from the files dispersed from the corporate records because of their lack of file and document structure. The R & D Librarian files were therefore read for content and context and also used by the researcher as a cross check for completeness against the LIS corporate records. In due course, however, these files were returned to the Closed Collection in the state in which they had been found.

Creating the corporate records
The retained paper records which constituted the LIS corporate records were found to be mostly in broad chronological order and appeared untouched since they had been removed from the administration section as working files, at the end of each year. On the other hand, the files from the R & D Librarian had some file structure and were generally ordered not only in chronological order but also by subject content. For example, there were specific files of documents about special activities within the strategic planning process, such as a file of documents covering minutes of the Planning Group meetings.

Once particular boxes of the LIS corporate records were located it was necessary to read broadly through the content of each box to locate any files or documents that in the researcher’s opinion might be relevant to the strategic planning process and hence of value to the study. This was a long and laborious process. Sometimes boxes contained files that were neat and tidy and appeared in chronological order and untouched since their removal from the administration section. Other boxes revealed a mass of individual documents in no particular order or sequence. In these disarranged boxes the physical condition of some documents had begun to deteriorate because of the poor conditions in which they were stored. This was so particularly with thermal fax copies of documents.
Sometimes, it was obvious that boxes were missing when large gaps in the chronology of events appeared. At these times it was necessary to restart the physical search for archival boxes. Overall, this stage of creating the corporate record proved very time consuming as it was complicated by the sheer volume of paper, the dispersed storage location and the obvious lack of organization of the files and documents.

Accordingly, before the research could proceed and before any accurate documentation of the events and activities of the LIS strategic planning process could begin, it was necessary to bring some order and sequence to the corporate records. This involved creating a record and file structure so as to make the corporate records useful for the research. Meanwhile, it was also necessary and essential to maintain the integrity and “in context” association of the records as they had been found, in case they were to be used in the future for other administrative and/or corporate reasons.

**Organizing the research archive**

Professional advice was sought from an archivist with training and experience in record management. Following this discussion it was determined that it was necessary for the researcher firstly to read through all the LIS corporate records located for the years relevant to the study. In the course of this preliminary reading specific files and documents thought relevant to the study were tagged for copying. Original files and documents were returned to the archive boxes and eventually to the physical storage location where they had been found.

The effect of this procedure was to create a LIS corporate record for the strategic planning process, as it should have been at the time of the creation of the documents. By imposing a structure and procedure on the copied documents the researcher constructed a mirror or research corporate record (or
research archive), that not only assisted with the study but also could, in due course, become part of the LIS corporate files.

The approach of copying relevant documents from the LIS corporate records and ordering them into files with a common and consistent hierarchy also left in tact the situation of the original documents and the condition in which they were found when located and accessed by the researcher. The research archive that was created then became the central and primary source for the documentation of the events and activities of the LIS strategic planning process and it was heavily used for the writing of chapter 4.

There were several options available to help structure the research archive. However, based on professional advice from the archivist, the structure used by the Curtin University Records and Archive Office, who manage University Council and Vice-Chancellory records, was selected. This was because, if a LIS records management system had formally existed at the time the documents were created, it was a fair assumption that such a system would probably have used a thesaurus already in use in another area of the university. The thesaurus is used to classify and index administrative documents of the University. While the thesaurus had been developed primarily for the Central Administrative Records, it can be adapted to include and/or incorporate other areas as required. The thesaurus is derived from the Keyword AAA Thesaurus developed by the Archives Authority of New South Wales and has been adapted with the inclusion of functional terms to meet the requirements of Curtin University of Technology. The keywords selected from Records and Archives Office thesaurus that are relevant to the file structure of the research archive are listed in Appendix 2.

Accordingly, the structure outlined in Table 3.1 was imposed to help order the research archive and to make it possible to cite and reference documents in the
thesis as well as to assist any future researchers wishing to retrieve documents quoted in the research. This approach also allowed for the citation and management of the references from the corporate records (or research archive) to be handled in the same way as references from published sources, through the use of the Endnote program.

Table 3.1: Library and Information Service (LIS) Corporate Records File Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEYWORDS</th>
<th>1st LEVEL DESCRIPTORS</th>
<th>2nd LEVEL DESCRIPTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Management</td>
<td>Consultant Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meetings</td>
<td>Agenda Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Briefing papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using this file plan a sample file title, in full, would read as:

- Library and Information Service – Corporate Records – Strategic Management – Meetings – Minutes.

A sample document description, in full, would read as:


When this structure is linked with the use of the APA style to cite references, the sample cited above would appear as follows in the bibliography:

```
LIS Corporate Records (5 June 1992)
Minutes of the Planning Group Meeting, (Strategic Management – Meetings – Minutes).
```

Within the thesaurus the term “STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT” is defined as covering:

The function of applying broad strategic management planning for the organization. Includes the activities with the development, monitoring, and reviewing of business plans, strategic plans, work plans, corporate plans, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) plans, Ethnic Affairs Policy Statements (EAPS) and agreements, energy and waste management plans and other long term organizational strategies. Also includes the development of the corporate mission, objectives, continuous improvement processes, quality assurance and certification, and the formulation and amendment of legislation which provides the legislative basis for the organization.

Data analysis

Once the problems associated with locating and assembling the data had been resolved, data analysis began.

At this stage, it quickly became evident that by imposing a file structure on the LIS corporate records, the reading and analysis of the data was made more
manageable. As the researcher became familiar with the content of the documents the process of analysis became more routine.

Also, while the number of LIS corporate records was large, most of the documents provided only contextual information. The most useful and significant data used in the study came from two key documents, namely the 85-page report from the Decision Conference and the actual strategic plan itself (LIS Corporate Record, 1992c; LIS Corporate Record, 1992d). These documents were particularly significant because they contained a great deal of raw data generated collectively in workshop conditions by the LIS staff at the time the strategic plan was developed.

The analysis of the data moved through several consecutive phases and involved several readings of the data, each associated with the general research questions but also with a particular dimension of the innovation and change framework, which emerged from the literature reviewed in chapter 2.

Phase I involved reading the LIS corporate records to create the research archive and to establish the researcher’s familiarity with the documents. This phase was a labor intensive and time consuming phase which involved reading the LIS corporate records over several years. It was obvious that the LIS corporate records for the first couple of years of the LIS strategic planning process would be critical to the study. However, it was also necessary to read the LIS corporate records for the period immediately preceding the start of the LIS strategic planning process.

Some selected published sources were also consulted during phase 1. For example, an annual report was published for every year of Allen’s tenure as Institute/University Librarian (1967-1991) and these provided valuable information.
In addition to being an essential step in creating the research archive as outlined above, this first-pass reading of the LIS corporate records also helped the researcher establish some familiarity with the types of documents and primary sources available as data for the study. The LIS corporate records applicable to this study were voluminous and covered approximately 20 standard archival storage boxes. Nevertheless, some documents emerged as key and critical to this study. This study relies very heavily on the 85-page *Decision Conference Report* (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d). This particular document contained a full summary of the Decision Conference held to formulate the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000* as well as the raw data contributed by the LIS staff during lead-up sessions and the Decision Conference itself.

Phase II involved reading the research archive to determine major events and activities especially in the first year of the LIS strategic planning process and to help establish the specific nature of the LIS strategic planning cycle. From this reading and using a large office whiteboard, a timeline, listing key events and activities, was developed. Events and activities were listed in order by the month and year in which they took place. This phase provided the basis for the content of chapter 4, the narrative of the LIS case. From the events and activities listed in the timeline it also became obvious that beyond about April 1993 events and activities of the LIS staff strategic planning process had became somewhat cyclic. In effect the LIS staff had regularized their strategic planning cycle.

Phase III involved reading the research archive in terms of the literature on innovation and change and in particular in terms of the theoretical framework that emerged from this literature and as presented in chapter 2. This phase involved several readings, each associated with analyzing the data in terms of the various dimensions of the innovation and change framework. Concurrently
with these readings, data was also being analyzed in terms of the research questions which underpin the study as presented in chapter 1.

Firstly, it was necessary read the data and to plot the LIS case in terms of the theoretical stages of the innovation. In particular, this involved identifying what were the key events and activities which marked the beginning and end of the various stages of innovation, commencing with adoption, through implementation and institutionalization. For example, when did implementation of the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000* begin? From this phase it was evident that the adoption phase of the innovation of strategic planning was somewhat uncharacteristically long and involved a number of very significant events and activities.

This led to a further and more detailed reading to analyze the events and activities described in chapter 4 in terms of the adoption phase of innovation and the initiation processes within that phase. This analysis is reported in chapter 5 in the section on change as an adoption-dominated process.

Next there was a reading to analyze the LIS case in terms of the organizational dimension of the innovation and change framework. This phase used the innovation and change framework to analyze the direction of the change desired by LIS staff. The analysis of the LIS case as a move towards a Learning Organization in terms of philosophy, management practice, employees (staff), customers (clients) and capacity to change is reported in chapter 5 in the section on change towards a learning organization.

The next phase used the innovation and change framework to analyze the impact of the characteristics of the context of change, and involved in particular note-taking and listing of characteristics about setting/scene, actors,
scenarios, issues and actions. This analysis is reported in chapter 5 in the section on change and the characteristics of the context of change.

Reading to analyze the LIS case in terms of what other factors were influencing the change was also undertaken. Again notes were taken about particular events and activities which highlighted how LIS staff developed a shared vision, how communication was used and how the wider environment impacted. This analysis is reported in chapter 5 in the section on other factors influencing change.

While the various phases described above were underway, answers in relation to the specific research questions underpinning the study were emerging. To help crystallize these a final confirming and reinforcing reading of the data was undertaken. This analysis is reported in chapter 5 in the section conclusions in relation to the research questions.

This final reading also highlighted a consistency between the conclusions in relation to the research questions and the findings in relation to the dimensions of the innovation and change framework. This consistency helped to confirm the viability of the innovation and change framework in helping to analyze the LIS case. It also raised the possibility of the innovation and change framework being applicable to other change processes.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS FROM THE LIS CASE

This chapter presents the specific details of the case of the LIS staff and their strategic planning process. It is presented as a descriptive chronology and narrative of events and activities undertaken by the LIS staff during the first year of the introduction of the innovation of strategic planning. However, to help set the scene and to give some historical context, relevant information about the history and development of the organization prior to the coming of change is presented.

Holistically, the events and activities described in this chapter follow a sequence. Firstly, there are events and activities with a wholly inward or internal focus to Curtin University of Technology and these bring internal pressures for change. Secondly, there are events and activities that help to draw the attention of the LIS staff externally, especially towards trends and developments in the information and library industry generally. These events and activities help to highlight external pressures for change. Thirdly, there are events and activities which combine these internal and external worlds and in that context help to focus the attention of the LIS staff onto the precise nature and extent of the change they are seeking to implement. This highlights events and activities designed to help the articulation of a vision. There are also events and activities associated with change management and implementation and with the routinization of the LIS strategic planning cycle. Accordingly, the chronology and narrative presented in this chapter describes the events and activities of the sequence using the following headings:

- Internal pressures for change.
- External pressures for change.
- Articulation of the vision.
- Change management and implementation
Routinization of the LIS strategic planning cycle

The chronology and description of events and activities from April 1992 to April 1993 has been constructed by using primary source documents from the official LIS corporate records. These records are comprised of various files containing individual documents, such as internal correspondence, reports, minutes of meetings and personal papers of the University Librarian. The corporate records were read to determine major events and activities of the strategic planning process and then used to write the narrative of the LIS case. Some published sources, for example conference proceedings and reports from major industry forums, were also used to help set the LIS events and activities into a wider library and information industry context.

BEFORE THE CHANGE

Background events
In January 1987 the Western Australian Institute of Technology (WAIT) became Curtin University of Technology. WAIT’s history, and hence the history of the institution’s library, can be traced back to 1965 when the institution commenced operations.

The WAIT Foundation Institute Librarian Mr G. G. Allen was among the first of five heads of department positions to be filled in 1967. The purpose-built T.L. Robertson Library building, which continues today to house the main library collections and services, was first occupied in 1971 (White, 1996).

Allen led the library’s development for 25 years and assumed the title of University Librarian in 1987 at the time WAIT became Curtin University. In the introduction to the 1991 Library Annual Report, his last as University Librarian, he noted:
While it is quite certain that Curtin does not have the best or largest collections, nor the most beautiful buildings, nor the most generous seating, and indeed for many years languished near the bottom of the resource league of academic libraries, it has still been possible to play a leading role nationally in a number of library developments (Curtin University of Technology Library, 1991).

Allen noted in particular, efforts in relation to reader education, some aspects of automation, research into library practices and library publishing as examples of areas where, in his opinion, the WAIT/Curtin Library had some major achievements over the years. Table 4.1 provides an overview of the size and operations of the Library at the end of 1991 and Table 4.2 depicts the LIS organizational structure by Divisions at the end of 1991.

Table 4.1: Overview of the size and operations of the Curtin University Library, 1991


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Titles Catalogued</th>
<th>Loan Transaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff $3,840,369</td>
<td>Monographs 12,332</td>
<td>Normal 236,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non salary $289,242</td>
<td>Serials 852</td>
<td>Renewals 22,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions $2,307,488</td>
<td>Audiovisual 899</td>
<td>Reserve 55,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment $69,247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During 1991, the Vice-Chancellor sought Allen’s agreement to begin the recruitment of a successor, pending Allen’s planned retirement at the end of 1992. At that time the University Librarian was responsible for setting library policy and overseeing the operations of the main library (the T. L. Robertson Library), the Curriculum Resources Centre in the Faculty of Education and the Therapy Library at the Shenton Park Campus. Branch libraries also operated at the University’s rural campuses at Muresk and Kalgoorlie. However, these
libraries operated independently and were not the responsibility of the University Librarian.

The recruitment process for the position of University Librarian extended over several months. It involved a lengthy consultation period during which detailed input from the campus community and others was sought on the role and responsibilities expected of the University Librarian. International and national advertisement of the position was also undertaken. At the time, Allen noted that “his opinions were sought on a number of aspects of the position description and the advertising campaign, and the Divisional Librarians were also involved” (Curtin University of Technology Library, 1991). He also noted that “the library staff at large were also involved in the process, with two of their number being appointed to the selection committee, through formal presentations by the interviewees, and with opportunities to meet the candidates” (Curtin University of Technology Library, 1991).

Position advertisements were placed in the international and national media and professional journals in August 1991. Interviews took place over a 3-day period in November 1991. The selection process involved short-listed candidates in a range of activities, including an open forum presentation where candidates were invited to give their vision for the future of academic libraries. The candidate eventually appointed to succeed Allen as University Librarian spoke on that occasion about government policy as a factor likely to influence the future strategic directions of Australian academic libraries.
In her concluding remarks, she noted that:

…above all, everyone working in academic libraries will need a very clear appreciation of the following:
1. Who are our customers? (The victims or beneficiaries of our operations.)
2. Who are the actors? (Who undertakes the activities.)
3. What transformation processes take place in our operations? (What are our inputs and outputs.)
4. What is the worldview of us? (How are we perceived by others.)
5. Who owns us? (Who can abolish us beyond recognition.)
6. What is the environment in which we work? (What are the constraints, impositions and influences impacting on our operations.) (Williamson, 1991).
Table 4.2 The Organizational Structure at the end of 1991

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN**
(52000A)

### TECHNICAL SERVICES LIBRARIAN (L7)
51002C, (52019K)

- **Monograph Acquisitions Librarian (L5)**
  52001J

- **Deputy Technical Services & Cataloguing Librarian**
  51008B

- **Serial Acquisitions Librarian (L5)**
  52002H

#### UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN
(52000A)

### TECHNICAL SERVICES LIBRARIAN (L7)
51002C, (52019K)

- **Supervising Library Assistant (L2)**
  55001C

- **0.5 Graduate Assistant (L1/2)**
  52006K

### Bindery Supervisor (L2)
57000D

- **Assistant Librarian (L2/4)**
  52011E

- **Supervising Library Assistant (L2)**
  55006D

### Assistant Librarian (2/4)
52012C

- **Graduate Assistant (1/2)**
  52006K

### Library Assistant (Binding Preparation)
55007B

- 3 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55116G, 55120C, 55103G

### 5 x Library Assistants (L1)
55138D, 55129G, 55125D, 55123H, 55100B, 57009H

- 2 x Binders (Wages)
  57001B, 57004G

### 7 x Asst Librarians (L2/4)
52111B, 52116C, 52101G, 52106H, 52105J, 52103C

### 5 x Library Assistants (L1)
55138D, 55129G, 55125D, 55123H, 55100B, 57009H

- 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
  57005E, 57006C

- 4 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55122J, 55110H, 55118C, 55000E

### 2 x Binders (Wages)
57001B, 57004G

### 0.5 Graduate Assistant (1/2)
52006K

- 3 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55116G, 55120C, 55103G

### 0.5 Graduate Assistant (1/2)
52006K

- 4 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55122J, 55110H, 55118C, 55000E

- 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
  57005E, 57006C

### 5 x Library Assistants (L1)
55138D, 55129G, 55125D, 55123H, 55100B, 57009H

### 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
57005E, 57006C

- 3 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55116G, 55120C, 55103G

### 4 x Library Assistants (L1)
55122J, 55110H, 55118C, 55000E

### 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
57005E, 57006C

### 2 x Binders (Wages)
57001B, 57004G

### 7 x Asst Librarians (L2/4)
52111B, 52116C, 52101G, 52106H, 52105J, 52103C

### 5 x Library Assistants (L1)
55138D, 55129G, 55125D, 55123H, 55100B, 57009H

- 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
  57005E, 57006C

- 3 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55116G, 55120C, 55103G

### 4 x Library Assistants (L1)
55122J, 55110H, 55118C, 55000E

### 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
57005E, 57006C

### 2 x Binders (Wages)
57001B, 57004G

### 7 x Asst Librarians (L2/4)
52111B, 52116C, 52101G, 52106H, 52105J, 52103C

### 5 x Library Assistants (L1)
55138D, 55129G, 55125D, 55123H, 55100B, 57009H

- 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
  57005E, 57006C

- 3 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55116G, 55120C, 55103G
Table 4.2 The Organizational Structure at the end of 1991

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN (52000A)**

** MANAGEMENT SERVICES LIBRARIAN (L7) (52018B)**

- **LAN Supervisor (L2)** 56013J
- **Admin Assistant (L3)** 55140D
- **3 x Clerical Assistants (L1)** 55130I, 55115I, 55003J, 56009C
- **3 x Photocopying (L1)** 55141B, 55114K, 55139B
- **2 x Programmers (L3)** 54004C, 54003E
- **1.5 x Data Processing Operators (L1)** 56005K, 56007G
- **Micro-Computer Support**
- **Graduate Assistant (L1/2)** 57002K
- **Library Assistant (L1)** 55113B
- **Library Assistant (L1) Semesters only** 55126B

- **Systems Officer (L5)** 54001I
- **Collection Management Librarian (L5)** 52022I
- **Planning & Research Librarian (L2/4)** 51007D, (52027J)
- **Therapy Branch Librarian (L5)** 52015H
- **Supervising Library Assistant (L1)** 55130J

- **1.5 x Word Processing Centre (L1)** 56003D, 56004B (.5)
Table 4.2 The Organizational Structure at the end of 1991

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN
(52000A)

PUBLIC SERVICES LIBRARIAN (L7)
52020B

Graduate Assistant (L1/2)
57117K

Research & Industry Support Librarian (Academic)
52026A

Information Services Librarian (L5)
52025A

Library Assistant 55105C

9.1 x Assistant Librarians
L2/4, 52025C, 52003F (.5), 52102E, 52014A, 52117A, 52005B, 52013A, 52014J, 52110D (.6), 52028H

Supervising Library Assistant (Loans Desk) (L2) 55005F

Supervising Library Assistant (Reserve) (L2) 55004H

Supervising Library Assistant (External A/V) (L2) 55111F

Supervising Library Assistant (I/LLs) (L2) 55008K

Supervising Library Assistant (CRC) (L2) 56012A

1 Attendant (L1)
Semesters only 53003K

6 x Attendants (L1)
53009J, 53004I, 53005G, 53007C, 53006E, 53058A

4 x Library Assistants (Semesters only)
55132E, 55143I, 55144G, 55142K

10.6 x Library Assistants (L1)

2 x Library Assistants (L1)
55108H, 55124F

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN
(52000A)

Research & Industry Support Librarian (Academic)
52026A

Information Services Librarian (L5)
52025A

Library Assistant 55105C

9.1 x Assistant Librarians
L2/4, 52025C, 52003F (.5), 52102E, 52014A, 52117A, 52005B, 52013A, 52014J, 52110D (.6), 52028H

Supervising Library Assistant (Loans Desk) (L2) 55005F

Supervising Library Assistant (Reserve) (L2) 55004H

Supervising Library Assistant (External A/V) (L2) 55111F

Supervising Library Assistant (I/LLs) (L2) 55008K

Supervising Library Assistant (CRC) (L2) 56012A

1 Attendant (L1)
Semesters only 53003K

6 x Attendants (L1)
53009J, 53004I, 53005G, 53007C, 53006E, 53058A

4 x Library Assistants (Semesters only)
55132E, 55143I, 55144G, 55142K

10.6 x Library Assistants (L1)

2 x Library Assistants (L1)
55108H, 55124F
Overview of the LIS organizational culture

The 25 years of the history and development of LIS under the leadership of Allen had entrenched a particular type of organizational and corporate library culture. By the end of Allen’s tenure, LIS exhibited some of the characteristics of the knowing (or classical) organization as identified in the literature on organizations reviewed in chapter 2 (McGill & Slocum, 1993). There were some noteworthy instances in the development of the library, which show evidence of these characteristics, especially as they relate to the five categories of the knowing organization, namely: philosophy, management practices, employees, customers and capacity to manage change.

For example, in terms of “management practices” LIS had on several occasions, and at Allen’s insistence, gone against standard industry practice in developing its professional policies and practices. This was particularly the case in respect of classification schemes and in the development of automated systems (White, 1996). Also, in terms of its relations with clients, Allen’s style often led to tension between the library and the University community. For example, there were protracted discussions at the University Academic Board about the Library Rules and academic staff loan limits during 1990 and 1991. At various times there was great tension also between Allen and the University Executive Management. These tensions focused around issues such as library budgets, delays in the building of the library extension and especially about the allocation of space to non-library tenants within the building. Typical of Allen’s style were his comments that appeared with frequency over the years in the introduction to the various issues of the Library Annual Report. For instance, writing about events of 1990, Allen commented: “If anticipation is really the greater part of pleasure then 1990 in Curtin University Library was mostly enjoyable even though the major anticipated pleasures were not in the end realised” (Curtin University of Technology Library, 1990).
Over the years there had also been tensions between Allen in his library management role and LIS staff, and relations between the two were not always harmonious. On two occasions during Allen’s tenure, this tension led the University’s Management to commission external reviews of the library. In 1975 “work pressure among library staff, interpersonal clashes and criticisms by academics built up to the point where staff called for intervention by the institute management” (White, 1996). While in 1985 “unrelenting economies”, delays in building the library extensions and an “antiquated and complicated systems based on outdated hardware” forced a second external review (White, 1996).

A few months after Allen’s departure from the position of University Librarian, LIS staff participated in a series of meetings where they were asked to express their views about the characteristics of the organizational culture of the library. Listed amongst the comments about their perceptions about organizational weaknesses were the following:

- Staff feel they do not have a non-threatening procedure to address problem issues.
- Staff morale is low.
- There is a lack of trust within the library.
- There is a lack of a sense of pride in the library as an organization.
- There isn’t a shared, positive common corporate culture throughout the organization.
- We do not have a strong image in the University.
- There is an us and them mentality on campus.
- The structure reduces the authority and opportunity for planning and decision-making of middle managers (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d).
INTERNAL PRESSURES FOR CHANGE

April 1992 - a new leader
The appointment of a new University Librarian signalled the beginning of the LIS change process. The successor to Allen, took up her appointment as University Librarian on 28 April 1992. Since 1988 she had worked as one of three Divisional Librarians in the position of Management Services Librarian at Curtin University of Technology. As a senior library staff member she was therefore well known to LIS staff, familiar with the operations of the University Library and well aware of the prevailing corporate culture.

One of her first actions as University Librarian was to meet with all LIS staff to outline her plans and ideas about future directions. She gave her inaugural library staff address, entitled The Coming of Change at meetings which took place on 30 April and 1 May 1992. In her address, the University Librarian announced that “there will be a formalized planning and policy development process involving the senior staff and other key staff on a regular and on-going basis” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992a).

The new University Librarian also noted the need to reassess directions and establish new priorities and she spoke about some of her priorities as University Librarian. She emphasized her vision of “building an information and library service that is responsive to clients needs and valued by the University” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992a). She indicated that she wanted “to assist in promoting Curtin University by building the professional reputation of the Curtin University Information and Library Service” and to see the library “exercise a leadership role in providing services to the Curtin Community” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992a).
The University Librarian noted that “to achieve this we need to be quite clear about what sort of information and library service we are building and initiate changes to make that vision a reality. In achieving the vision I feel we must also work closely with other key people on campus” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992a).

She spoke in broad terms about a process whereby senior staff and section heads would work with the University Librarian to complete a Future Directions Statement. The University Librarian signalled her intention that such a statement would outline clearly and precisely to clients, all LIS staff and other stakeholders “the library’s future directions and critical factors likely to influence that direction” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992a). The University Librarian stated that “during this process of developing this statement we will define more precisely what sort of information and library service we are working towards. That way everyone will have a clear picture of what we are working towards” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992a).

Finally, the University Librarian identified five key issues that she regarded as critical in determining future directions and these were:

1. What sort of information and library service are we building.
2. How we use the available and emerging information technologies to effect service delivery.
3. How we communicate with our clients and the University Community.
4. How we communicate and work together.
5. How we manage and learn from our change process (LIS Corporate Record, 1992a).

Seeking help from others within Curtin
In keeping with her pledge to work with other key people on campus to help the LIS staff achieve a shared vision for the future, the University Librarian sought resistance from academic staff in the then Division of Business and Administration. Two academic staff, one from the School of Information
Systems and one from the School of Management and Marketing were engaged as consultants to the University Librarian. Their brief was to assist with the formulation of a Future Directions Statement and a shared vision for the future of the University Library.

The consultants suggested the use of some techniques that found their theoretical basis in Soft Systems Methodology (Checkland, 1981). In particular, they suggested the use of Decision Conferencing as “the vehicle to help senior management formalize its strategic planning” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d). Decision Conferencing is a process that brings together a group of people belonging to an organization who need to make a decision on a complex issue. The process aims to develop a shared understanding among participants of the issues discussed, and to foster a commitment to carry out the actions finally decided upon. All aspects of the problem are raised, objectives identified, strategies discussed and an action plan developed.

Decision Conferences are generally held over two days. Participants are assisted by a trained facilitator and analyst team to enunciate their views on the key issues and to consolidate these views to enable decisions on the issues to be made. Computer technology is used to model these decisions. The models are then used as an aid to discussion about possible alternative approaches and emphases, and to help develop a shared understanding of the issues. The models enable debate to center on those variables that are critical to the decisions to be made. The final stage of a Decision Conference is the development of an action plan.

The University Librarian determined that a Decision Conference would be held on the 6 and 7 August with the explicit purpose “to formulate a statement on the future direction of the Curtin University of Technology Library and Information Service” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d).
Gathering staff input

In various pre-conference meetings involving the facilitators and the University Librarian, the format for the Decision Conference was discussed, the process was explained, and the issue for discussion was clarified. The twelve LIS staff who would participate in the Decision Conference was also confirmed during these pre-conference meetings. The positions held by these LIS staff and the relationships of these positions in the LIS divisional structure are contained in Table 4.3.

A prime consideration in deciding on appropriate events and activities preparatory to the Decision Conference was the incorporation of LIS staff input into the deliberations of the senior staff members participating in the Decision Conference. It was therefore agreed that LIS staff not directly participating in the Decision Conference would be invited to express their opinions on a number of issues of concern to the University Librarian in her position as Head, and of relevance to the strategic questions to be considered by the Decision Conference participants. The facilitators to obtain this LIS staff input, used a technique known as MeetingWare (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d).

MeetingWare combines the principles of nominal group techniques with the use of information technology, and therefore can be likened to a mechanized nominal group technique. It allows participants to enter ideas and comments anonymously by inputting data (comments or ideas) via computer terminals. This raw data is then displayed to the whole group and each idea is discussed and clarified. Sometimes this stage results in clarification and combining original data to better reflect what the group considers the issue or idea. In the final stage of the MeetingWare technique the group as a whole ranks each statement in order of its importance to the group as a whole. Decision Conference participants did not attend MeetingWare sessions.
Table 4.3: Decision Conference participants by positions held within LIS divisional structure

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN**
(52000A)

**TECHNICAL SERVICES LIBRARIAN (L7)**
51002C, (52019K)

**Monograph Acquisitions Librarian (L5)**
52001J

- Supervising Library Assistant (L2)
  55001C

- 4 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55122J, 55110H, 55118C, 55000E

- 2 x Binders (Wages)
  57001B, 57004G

- 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
  57005E, 57006C

**Deputy Technical Services & Cataloguing Librarian (L5)**
51008B

- Bindery Supervisor (L2)
  57000D

- 7 x Assistant Librarians (L2/4)
  52011B, 52116C, 52101G, 52106H, 52105J, 52103C

- 0.5 Graduate Assistant (L1/2)
  52006K

- 5 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55138D, 55129G, 55125D, 55123H, 55100B, 57009H

**Serial Acquisitions Librarian (L5)**
52002H

- Assistant Librarian (2/4)
  52012C

- 3 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55116G, 55120C, 55103G

- 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
  57005E, 57006C

**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN**
(52000A)

**TECHNICAL SERVICES LIBRARIAN (L7)**
51002C, (52019K)

**Monograph Acquisitions Librarian (L5)**
52001J

- Supervising Library Assistant (L2)
  55001C

- 4 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55122J, 55110H, 55118C, 55000E

- 2 x Binders (Wages)
  57001B, 57004G

- 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
  57005E, 57006C

**Deputy Technical Services & Cataloguing Librarian (L5)**
51008B

- Bindery Supervisor (L2)
  57000D

- 7 x Assistant Librarians (L2/4)
  52011B, 52116C, 52101G, 52106H, 52105J, 52103C

- 0.5 Graduate Assistant (L1/2)
  52006K

- 5 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55138D, 55129G, 55125D, 55123H, 55100B, 57009H

**Serial Acquisitions Librarian (L5)**
52002H

- Assistant Librarian (2/4)
  52012C

- 3 x Library Assistants (L1)
  55116G, 55120C, 55103G

- 1.6 x Sewers (Wages)
  57005E, 57006C
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**UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN**  
(52000A)

LAN Supervisor (L2)  
56013J

Admin Assistant (L3)  
55140D

Systems Officer (L5)  
54001I

**Collection Management Librarian**  
(L5)  
52022I

**Planning & Research Librarian**  
(L2/4)  
51007D,  
(52027J)

**Therapy Branch Librarian**  
(L5)  
52015H

- **Store Person** (L1)  
55130I

- **3 x Clerical Assistants**  
(L1)  
55115I,  
55003J,  
56009C

- **3 x Photocopying**  
(L1)  
55141B,  
55114K,  
55139B

- **2 x Programmers**  
(L3)  
54004C,  
54003E

- **1.5 x Data Processing Operators**  
(L1)  
56005K,  
56007G

- **Micro-Computer Support**

- **Graduate Assistant**  
(L1/2)  
57002K

- **Supervising Library Assistant**  
(L1)  
55123B

- **Library Assistant**  
(L1)  
55104E

- **Library Assistant**  
(L1) Semesters only  
55126B

- **1.5 x Word Processing Centre**  
(L1)  
56003D,  
56004B (.5)

- **Systems Officer**  
(L5)  
54001I
Table 4.3: Decision Conference participants by positions held within LIS divisional structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Attendants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Services Librarian</td>
<td>52026A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Industry Support Librarian (Academic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian (Academic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Academic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (Loans Desk) (L2)</td>
<td>55005F</td>
<td>9.1 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52007I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55105C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52006G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55004H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (External A/V) (L2)</td>
<td>55111F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (ILLs) (L2)</td>
<td>55008K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (Reserve) (L2)</td>
<td>55003F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Tech (L2)</td>
<td>53000F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (CRC) (L2)</td>
<td>56012A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation Librarian (L5)</td>
<td>52021K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICES LIBRARIAN (L7)</td>
<td>52020B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN</td>
<td>52000A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>52112K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>520112K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55105C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52007I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55105C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52006G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55004H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (Loans Desk) (L2)</td>
<td>55005F</td>
<td>10.6 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52006G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55004H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (External A/V) (L2)</td>
<td>55111F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (ILLs) (L2)</td>
<td>55008K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (Reserve) (L2)</td>
<td>55003F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Tech (L2)</td>
<td>53000F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (CRC) (L2)</td>
<td>56012A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services Librarian (L7)</td>
<td>52020B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN</td>
<td>52000A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>52112K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>520112K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55105C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52007I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55105C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52006G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55004H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (Loans Desk) (L2)</td>
<td>55005F</td>
<td>10.6 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52006G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55004H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (External A/V) (L2)</td>
<td>55111F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (ILLs) (L2)</td>
<td>55008K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (Reserve) (L2)</td>
<td>55003F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Tech (L2)</td>
<td>53000F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (CRC) (L2)</td>
<td>56012A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Services Librarian (L7)</td>
<td>52020B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN</td>
<td>52000A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>52112K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>520112K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55105C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52007I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55105C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52006G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55004H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (Loans Desk) (L2)</td>
<td>55005F</td>
<td>10.6 x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Librarian (L2/4)</td>
<td>52006G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Assistant</td>
<td>55004H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (External A/V) (L2)</td>
<td>55111F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (ILLs) (L2)</td>
<td>55008K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (Reserve) (L2)</td>
<td>55003F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV Tech (L2)</td>
<td>53000F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising Library Assistant (CRC) (L2)</td>
<td>56012A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The University Librarian communicated information about the Decision
Conference to all LIS staff and invited interested LIS staff to participate in the
development of a Future Directions Statement by giving their input through the
MeetingWare sessions (LIS Corporate Record, 1992l).

The University Librarian also distributed to the LIS staff invited to be Decision
Conference participants information about the process, the names of those she
had invited to be part of the Decision Conference and her proposed timeline for
the process of developing the Future Directions Statement. The University
Librarian also announced the topics for discussion and input from LIS staff
through the MeetingWare sessions. The topics were:

- Dimension of service quality and service delivery.
- Communication.
- Training and Development.
- Team-work and enterprise.
- Aspects of an ideal library (LIS Corporate Record, 1992g).

The facilitators on 4, 5, 8 and 9 June 1992 conducted a total of five
MeetingWare sessions to obtain LIS staff input. Each session ran for
approximately two hours, involved a maximum of 10 participants and dealt with
two topics as follows:

- Group 1: Communication and Dimension of service quality and service
delivery.
- Group 2: Communication and Training and Development.
- Group 3: Training and Development and Teamwork and Enterprise.
- Group 4: Teamwork and Enterprise and Aspects of the ideal Library.
- Group 5: Dimensions of service quality and service delivery and Aspects of
the ideal library.
A sixth MeetingWare session was held on 29 June 1992 for some selected library clients (academic staff and student representatives) to give their input on the topic of aspects of an ideal library. In all, over 50 of the 116 equivalent full-time LIS staff attended MeetingWare sessions.

Therefore, by the end of June 1992 all LIS staff and client input to be used by the participants in the Decision Conference had been collected and collated. The University Librarian then circulated this information to Decision Conference participants (LIS Corporate Record, 1992h; LIS Corporate Record, 1992i).

The input gathered during the MeetingWare sessions was extensive and contained a great deal of data that was subsequently fed into the Decision Conference proceedings as diagrammed in Table 4.4. At the conclusion of the Decision Conference all of the data gathered at the MeetingWare sessions and used in the Decision Conference deliberations, was brought together into a formal report, which was prepared by the facilitators. Accordingly, all of the data gathered at the MeetingWare sessions was fully and directly available, both to the Decision Conference participants and as data for this study.
Other pre-decision conference activities
During June 1992, the University Librarian also arranged some special activities for the Decision Conference participants, which were intended as a stimulus to encourage them to think broadly about issues and trends in higher education that had potential to impact on Curtin University in particular. For example, information sessions covering a description of the institutional student profile was presented by the University Academic Registrar and an outline of the University’s research profile was given by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Development) (LIS Corporate Record, 1992g).

Summary of internal pressures for change (April – June 1992)
The arrival of a new leader and her almost immediate move to establish a formal planning process signalled to the LIS staff that the change process had
begun. While it would take many more months for the precise nature of the change to be defined collectively by the LIS staff, the University Librarian made some important first steps to encourage the LIS staff to begin to think more broadly about the future of their organization. This early sequence of events and activities was focused within the immediate environment of Curtin University. Nevertheless, it signalled to LIS staff that an important characteristic of the strategic planning process would be the consideration of what was happening within the environment beyond the immediate workplace and context of the library. LIS staff began tentative steps to look beyond the library to help shape the future of their professional practice.

Other characteristics of the change process also began to emerge in this early sequence of events and activities. For example, the involvement of other Curtin University staff (non-LIS staff) and the selective use of consultants.

In this sequence of events and activities there is also a heavy emphasis by the University Librarian on communication with LIS staff and the sharing of information. A variety of techniques emerged in the sequence. For example, from the LIS corporate records it was evident that a range of techniques were used to communicate information to LIS staff. Specifically, the University Librarian called a series of whole of LIS staff meetings and she repeated the content of these meetings so as to ensure that as many LIS staff as possible attended, but without disruption to library services. Also, the University Librarian used memos addressed to all LIS staff rather than communicating information through the formal organizational structure by using divisional librarians and/or section heads to pass on information.
EXTERNAL PRESSURES FOR CHANGE

The external industry environment
The Decision Conference participants were not directly involved in any of the MeetingWare sessions. However, in the months leading up to the actual Decision Conference they were urged by the University Librarian, “to consult relevant professional literature about current and likely future trends for library and information service delivery” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992g). They were asked to focus their attention and thoughts on the big picture issues emerging through the professional literature and in the information and library industry generally.

The LIS staff was not alone in pondering the options of what libraries might be like into the future. The professional literature at the time was preoccupied with this topic and especially about the opportunities potentially afforded by new and emerging information and communication technologies. There was much written in the literature and discussed at professional conferences about the impact of the electronic library. Overlaying the political and economic events impacting on Australian universities in the post-Dawkins era made the challenges for Australian academic libraries especially topical. Some of the publications that appeared to have captured the interest of LIS staff around the time of their Decision Conference were found among the LIS Corporate Records (Buckland, 1992; Dougherty & Hughes, 1991; University of Wollongong Library, 1991).

Confronting the future: university libraries in the next decade
In June 1992, the University Librarian and the senior staff (the Public Services Librarian and the Technical Services Librarian) attended a major industry forum entitled: Confronting the future: university libraries in the next decade (Rayward, 1992). This one-day conference, attended by approximately 100
participants was held at the University of New South Wales (UNSW) in Sydney on Friday, 12 June 1992. There had been a National Library Summit held at the National Library in Canberra in 1988, and over subsequent years there is evidence in the literature of several specialist meetings and conferences focusing on issues of concern to librarians. For example, since 1993 the National Scholarly Communication Forum (NSCF) has sponsored a number of Roundtable Meetings to highlight issues impacting on the library and information industry (Williamson, 1997).

Nevertheless, the UNSW meeting appears to be the first meeting focusing exclusively on Australian university libraries and involving a wide-range of key stakeholders, beyond just librarians. For example, in attendance were the service providers (the university librarians and their senior staff), institutional executive managers (the Vice-Chancellors and Deputy Vice-Chancellors) and funding providers and administrators of higher education (political and government representatives) (LIS Corporate Record, 1992m).

The UNSW Conference attempted “to identify a complex, interacting, overlapping set of issues, questions, problems and topics that should be part of any discussion about the future of library services in universities” (Henderson & Rayward, 1992). In this circumstance it raised issues that bore some overlap with the topics identified for LIS staff input and comment through the MeetingWare sessions and the context of what the LIS staff hoped to achieve through their Decision Conference. For example, the Conference covered topics such as the roles and function of university libraries, managing the university library in the future, new technology and the electronic library. It also raised other general issues relevant to the deliberations, discussions and planning of the LIS staff, in particular, general issues of vital importance were also noted and covered:
The difficulty of realistically assessing what is currently feasible.

Developing strategies to anticipate and monitor change and development that are occurring in the “industry”.

Developing management strategies to deal with what is required to implement change effectively in terms of infrastructure, equipment and staff training.

The problem of entrenched attitudes and patterns of behavior both of clients and staff and of anticipating and dealing effectively and sympathetically with the likely impact of technological changes on them.

Estimating costs in the present and in the short term and developing strategies to meet them.

The problem of developing an appropriate technological infrastructure and effective staff support of the service and systems that depend on it. Striking and effective balance between the costs and benefits of participating in international, national and regional networks and what is foregone in terms of services and collections at the local level because of the costs of such participation (Henderson & Rayward, 1992 p. 6).

The keynote speaker at the Conference was Professor Michael Buckland from the University of California at Berkeley. Professor Buckland analyzed the changing nature of the university library and stressed the importance of its being able to participate effectively in the increasingly electronic world of information transfer. He noted that paper libraries would continue to co-exist with new electronic services and sources (LIS Corporate Record, 1993c). His recently released book entitled Redesigning Library Services: A manifesto also had its Australian launch at the Conference.

Buckland’s manifesto

Buckland succinctly captured the issues facing libraries at the beginning of the 1990s (Buckland, 1992). In the Introduction to Buckland’s book, Gorman wrote that what the author is telling us is:

Here is where we are and where we have been;
Here is the likely direction in which we are going;
Here is the impact of the likely future on libraries, library services, and library users; and
Here is how we should organize ourselves and run our libraries to respond to the challenges of change (Buckland, 1992 p. viii).

In retrospect, Gorman’s words to introduce Buckland’s book also summarize precisely what the LIS staff were seeking to do through their innovation of using a strategic planning process to both determine the nature and extent of change but also to help drive through the change at the organizational level.

**Preferred future for libraries**

The issues and trends emerging from the UNSW Conference bear a striking similarity to a listing of trends identified by university provosts and library directors in the United States at a meeting in 1991 (Dougherty & Hughes, 1991). The identified trends to emerge from USA Conference included:

- Developing the national research and education network.
- Strengthening undergraduate education.
- Increasingly constrained budgets.
- Proliferating information sources and spiralling costs of materials.
- Pressing space and facilities maintenance needs.
- Changing scholarly communication system.
- Expanding international studies and programs.
- Increasing interdependence of library and computing center.
- Decreasing prestige of higher education in society.
- Growing difficulties in recruitment and retaining personnel.
- Shifting student demographics.
- Building relationships with the commercial sector.
- Growing importance of government relations.
The AIMA workshops
During July 1992 an external training consultant from the Australian Information Management Association (AIMA), a well-recognized and highly regarded industry training authority within the Australian library sector, presented two, two-day workshops, on the topics of “Managing Organizational Change” and “Working Together” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992). These workshops brought together, in some instances for the first time, staff from different library sections and of different work classifications. The workshops also exposed the LIS staff to the thinking and training expertise of one of Australia’s most highly regarded library and information industry experts, Ms Margaret Trask.

Trask had a long and distinguished record in professional practice and library education. She had a long association with the University of New South Wales (UNSW), where from 1963 until 1967 she was the Senior Librarian, Methods and Training. From 1967 to 1974 she held various positions in the School of Librarianship at UNSW, including that of Acting Head of School. In 1975 Trask was appointed as the Foundation Head of the School of Library and Information Studies at Kuring-gai College of Advanced Education. Trask retired from this position in 1985 but remained extremely active and influential in the profession through her work as a freelance consultant. Trask has had a very close association with AIMA since its foundation in 1985. Trask who was awarded a Fellowship of the LAA in 1969 and an Order of Australia in 1979, has been described as “one of the most influential and articulate of Australia’s library educators” (Bryan, 1991).

At Trask’s insistence the workshops were held off-campus and away from the immediate work environment of both the library and the university. The
workshops were supported by the University Librarian as part of preparatory activities leading to the formulation of a shared vision for the future of the LIS.

Summary of external pressures for change (June-July 1992)
The important events and activities of this period took LIS staff beyond their immediate environment of Curtin University and helped to introduce them to current industry thinking. They also highlight the first organized efforts towards some form of organizational development. The UNSW Conference especially helped to reinforce that that LIS staff were not alone in pondering the future of libraries. It helped to confirm that while there was much excitement about the possibilities offered by new and emerging information and communication technology, no-one had yet really explored all of the professional practice implications of electronic information. The electronic library was still at this stage a topic of speculation and forecast. While people debated the merits or otherwise of “just in case” versus “just in time” libraries, no-one yet had all the answers about the future of libraries.

The events and activities in this sequence provided LIS staff with opportunities for independent group and individual discussions and helped LIS staff to free up their thinking and verify their ideas in an open and collegial manner. In particular, the AIMA workshops also provided LIS staff with some preliminary skills and techniques in managing and coping with change and working in teams – skills which were to become more critical as the nature and extent of the change process unfolded. For some LIS staff these were first-time experiences.

This sequence of events and activities also brought a highly regarded industry representative into the LIS. In this context, Trask was not only able to help the LIS staff to express ideas and professional views but also, from the basis of her strong professional reputation, she was able to challenge and question some of the ideas being expressed. The University Librarian was also able to use the
ARTICULATION OF THE VISION

Where are we now and where do we want to be?
The Decision Conference was held on the 6 and 7 August 1992 in the Planning and Decisions Domain in the Division of Business and Administration at Curtin University. The consultants facilitated and analyzed data during the course of the Decision Conference.

The formal report provided by the consultants gives a detailed description and technical account of the conduct of the activities during the course of the Decision Conference (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d). On several occasions throughout the report it was noted that comments and matters were “discussed at length” by the participants.

Day 1 of the Decision Conference was very much concerned with where the LIS was currently placed and what was the desired future. In her introduction to Day 1 the University Librarian again “spoke of her personal commitment to the development of a shared vision for the library” and the need for a sustainable strategy to provide “a flexible, pro-active, focused position for its operation” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d). Participants first clarified the issue for discussion and determined that the appropriate timeframe for planning purposes was a planning horizon of some 10 to 20 years hence, but that the strategy to be formulated should address the immediate future through until around the year 2000.

To address the issue of future directions, the participants first described in detail what they felt was the present situation in regard to each of the relevant areas of
the library’s operations. Their description was in terms of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats – or what is more commonly termed a SWOT analysis. SWOT stands for Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats and has been defined as follows: “a four part approach to analyzing a company’s overall strategy or the strategy of its business units. All four aspects must be considered to implement a long-range plan of action” (Collett, 1999).

Participants incorporated data from the MeetingWare sessions in this stage of their deliberations. The points raised and discussed by the participants therefore represented a composite of their perceptions and interpretations of the current state of affairs. Participants also rated items raised at this stage in terms of importance (or its urgency and potential impact), as low, medium or high.

Participants then moved to the where do we want to be or desired future stage. With assistance from the analysts, those elements which appeared to underlie much of the participants’ thinking about their desired future were brought together and presented to the participants in the form of a statement and a preliminary set of broad objectives. From this, some 25 statements became the agreed descriptors for the LIS desired future state. These statements are presented in Table 4.5 in full, as they remained consistent for the LIS staff during the course of their change process.
Table 4.5: Desired future statements
(Source: Decision Conference Report, 1992, Appendix D, p. 23)

- Users would gain ready access from wherever they are, to information and documents at the time of need through the services that we offer.
- Client focus/quality service culture.
- Accessible, skilled, approachable and innovative staff.
- Up-to-date staff with the most recent and appropriate technology.
- Essential to and integrated with the university’s programs.
- Adequate resources to achieve desired goals.
- We have a reputation such that people want to work within the organization.
- The staff will have a high professional reputation.
- The library is regarded internationally as a model of excellence within a specific area.
- An environment that allows staff to grow personally and professionally.
- An organizational culture which fosters trust and pride in the organization.
- We have collections that are well targeted to meet the needs of the client base.
- We have effective communication channels within the library and the university.
- Effective document (including digital documentation) delivery.
- We are highly valued by our users.
- We have a defined focus and set of goals.
- We have state-of-the art automated systems for internal operations and access to information both internal and external.
- Effective and dynamic leadership.
- Librarians are valued as teachers of information literacy.
- We cater for the specific needs of different user groups.
- We are a dynamic organization that is flexible enough to respond to changing needs.
- We are recognized as a key player in university policy formulation and resource allocation.
- Librarians are valued as effective navigators of the information universe.
- We are proud of our building.
Drawing these statements together, a combined vision/mission statement was developed and agreed by the participants that it “captured the essence of their deliberations” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d).

The Curtin Library and Information Service is a client-focused, dynamic university Library and Information Service which provides clients and client groups with ready and timely access to information, including efficient document delivery. We value the quality of service to our clients.

The Curtin University of Technology Library and Information Service aims to be a source of pride to its staff, to Curtin University, and to the library and information profession, functioning as an integral; part of the University’s teaching, research and learning programmes with state-of-the art systems and technology.

We aim to provide a stimulating work environment and professional development for our staff.

This statement was intended to guide the work of LIS staff and the operation of the LIS during the course of the change process.

How will we get there?
The participants then moved to the strategy formulation stage, which required the participants to develop feasible strategies through which they would work to achieve their desired future state. Having generated alternative strategies, computer modelling was used to evaluate them in order to identify the most appropriate and desirable thrust for the LIS.

The participants developed six possible strategic options for achieving their desired future directions. Table 4.6 lists these options including the analysts’ abbreviated titles, which were used for convenience and computer modelling purposes, in parentheses.
Table 4.6: Possible strategic options
(Source: Decision Conference Report, 1992, p. 8)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Client Service Focus (CLIENT/S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal/external marketing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of client needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Education Focus (EDUCATION)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information literacy skills for life-long learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Part of the learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IT Focus (IT FOCUS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using technology to access information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information presented in various formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use IT to improve efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use of automated systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means of remote access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collection/Information Access Focus (COLLECTN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inhouse collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access to remote collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>identification and location of information and documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Staff Focus (STAFF)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training, development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Flexibility of working options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Strategic Alliance Focus (ALLIANCE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal to Curtin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>External to Curtin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political focus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The process of Decision Conferencing became somewhat technical at this point as participants turned to the identification of the major factors which differentiated between these alternative strategies. To help this stage of the process a list of attributes was developed, and these attributes were then grouped into categories representing the benefits and the costs that could accrue under each of the strategies. Table 4.7 lists these attributes including the analysts’ abbreviated titles, which were used for convenience and computer modelling purposes, in parentheses.

Table 4.7: Strategy attributes in terms of benefits and costs
(Source: Decision Conference Report, 1992, pp. 9-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Flexible (adaptability) (FLEXIBLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Pro-active (PRO-ACTIVE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Amount of client support (positive feedback) (CLSUPPORT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Power (POWER)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Contribution to library staff commitment (COMMITMENT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Sustainability (SUSTAIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Feasibility (Achieving the strategy) (FESIBILITY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Innovation (excitement) (EXCITEMENT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Autonomy (ability to do what you want when you want) (AUTONOMY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ $ Costs (COSTS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Effort (to implement) (EFFORT)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Risk (RISK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Demand on training requirements (TRAINING)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Desired future state - Future Directions Statement

From this stage of the Decision Conferencing process, the participants gained insights and a heightened awareness of the trade-off involved between the different strategic options, through both the computer modelling and from the extensive discussion of various strategic options. There emerged among the participants therefore a greater understanding of the complexities involved in deciding between the various strategic options. The important element to emerge at this stage of the Decision Conference was that no-one single strategic option was preferred. Accordingly, the agreed approach represented a composite of the most favorable elements of the strategic options assessed in the model (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d). The agreed way forward was that LIS staff would work on each of the six strategic options as these would all be critical factors to their success in achieving their agreed desired future state. Indeed, eventually these same six strategic options became known within the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 as the LIS Key Result Areas (KRAs) and over time it was these six KRAs which guided the change process.

The participants summarized the chosen combined strategic thrust as follows:

1. A major emphasis on client service, involving a systematic evaluation of client requirements and attention to all aspects of internal and external marketing.
   And in light of this

2. Develop a comprehensive, targeted and responsive collection development, information access and document delivery programme.

3. Focus on our human resources, especially training and development, the working environment and flexible working options.

These emphases will necessarily incorporate the development of IT capabilities and the negotiation of strategic alliances and the acquisition of appropriate resources.
What will we do now?
The final task for the participants was the development of a first round of actions that would set the strategic options in motion, and address the major weaknesses and threats previously identified in the analysis of the “now” situation. Table 4.8 summarizes the 10 action plans formulated by the participants.

Table 4.8: Action plans
(Source: Decision Conference Report, 1992, p.16)

- define its client groups
- survey client group requirements
- develop a marketing plan
- work towards acquiring an integrated computer system
- investigate new technology for accessing and delivering remote information
- develop a comprehensive human resources plan
- improve internal LIS communications
- create flexible working structures for its staff
- develop a comprehensive, targeted and responsive program for collection development, information access and document delivery
- identify and develop strategic alliances with key individuals, groups and institutions.

Summary of the articulation of the vision (August 1992)
Above all other events and activities, the Decision Conference brought together the internal experiences of the LIS staff within the world of Curtin University and combined these with the recent exposure to trends and developments in the external world. In bringing these two worlds together, the Decision Conference helped LIS staff to determine a new course for their professional practice. Throughout the Decision Conference report there are many references to the idea that LIS staff were engaging in something very new and exploring new
frontiers and new ways of doing things. Perhaps the most powerful symbol of the frontier analogy comes from the formulation of the motto (or rally cry) of “Helping our clients to navigate the information universe” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992d).

Nevertheless, the most significant outcome of this sequence of events and activities was the formulation of an agreed statement about future directions. Through a sequence of events and activities spread over several months, the LIS staff shared vision for the future of their professional practice had been determined. The change process was moving forward.

CHANGE MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Immediate post decision conference activities
Following the completion of the desired future statement (or the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 as it was now termed) other events and activities were undertaken during the course of the next six months that helped LIS staff to complete their first year of the change process.

The University Librarian, on behalf of all of the participants in the Decision Conference, acted quickly to convey the outcome of the Decision Conference to all LIS staff. On 10 August 1992, the University Librarian wrote to all LIS staff about the shared vision that had emerged through the Decision Conference. In particular, the University Librarian noted:

The future direction process has involved all staff and given them opportunities to express their views and concerns. I am impressed with the quality of input to this process. Furthermore, I am grateful not only for the time staff have given, but also for their obvious commitment to taking us forward into new and very exciting directions. I am particularly heartened at the speed with which the Decision Conference participants became committed to this shared vision and to its implementation (LIS Corporate Record, 1992j).
Special mention was made by the University Librarian in this communiqué about the information provided by LIS staff through the MeetingWare sessions. In particular, she noted that “the information gathered from staff prior to the Decision Conference gave Senior Staff and Section Heads a clear message that staff share our concerns about internal communication” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992j).

The University Librarian therefore signalled that improved internal communication was “critical to the success of anything we set out to achieve and that this issue demands immediate attention” (LIS Corporate Record, 1992j). Over the coming months the University Librarian established a number of initiatives to help improve internal communication. These included amongst other things, establishing the practice of personally visiting and speaking with LIS staff work groups across the library on a rotational basis once a month, something which she had originally suggested in her inaugural address to LIS staff (LIS Corporate Record, 1992a). A Working Party comprising representatives from across library sections and work classifications was also established to examine the issue and to make recommendations for improvement and change (LIS Corporate Record, 1992b).

As foreshadowed in her minute to LIS staff, the University Librarian held general LIS staff meetings during the week of 24 August 1992 where she spoke about the outcomes of the Decision Conference and introduced LIS staff to the contents of the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000* (LIS Corporate Record, 1992j).

In November 1992 a full-colour brochure summarizing the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000* was released and widely circulated, both internally within Curtin University and externally to relevant groups, such as other university libraries, LIS suppliers and professional bodies (LIS Corporate Record, 1992c).
During the remainder of 1992 the University Librarian established a number of operational structures and organizational groups to help oversee the process of change and to assist with progressing specific actions. These structures and groups were also designed to aid on-going communication about the changes within the LIS and to ensure the widest possible participation of LIS staff in the change process.

The Library and Information Service Strategic Planning Group (LISPG)
The LISPG, comprised of those persons who participated in the Decision Conference, was set up by the University Librarian to help progress the agreed action plans and to monitor progress with the strategic planning process. The LISPG had its first meeting very shortly after the Decision Conference on the 13 August 1992, and continued to meet on a regular basis until the end of 1992 (LIS Corporate Record, 1992e).

By the start of semester 1, 1993, the role of monitoring progress with the strategic planning process was carried out by the senior staff. Regular twice-monthly meetings of the Senior Management Team (SMT), comprising the University Librarian, Deputy University Librarian and the two Divisional Librarians were introduced (LIS Corporate Record, 1993b). Nevertheless, the larger LISPG did continue to meet from time to time to discuss specific action plans and projects when required. For example, three LIS staff working parties were established after the Decision Conference to start addressing the major human resource issues of internal communication, flexible working arrangements and LIS staff induction (LIS Corporate Record, 1992k). In due course the reports and recommendations of these working parties were discussed by the LISPG before changes in these areas were eventually introduced.
Library and Information Service Advisory Committee (LISAC)

The LISAC had its first meeting on 16 November 1992. LISAC was established as the formal link between the LIS staff and its client groups (academic staff and students) and as the focus for formal client interaction, advice and feedback. It was a mechanism to help ensure that clients and client groups were consulted and that their needs were taken into account in the planning and development of library services. LISAC was established with formal links to the University community through the institution’s Committee and decision-making system, by virtue of its establishment as a standing committee of the University Academic Board (UAB).

The establishment of LISAC was a direct link to the expressed desired future of the LIS staff to be client focused and to consult with clients about their information needs. It was also the first time in the history of the University Library that a formal advisory and consultative mechanism involving library clients had been established.

The formal Terms of Reference for LISAC were that the Committee should:

- advise on proposed changes to the Library Status or the Library Rules contained in it.
- receive and transmit the University Librarian’s Annual Report.
- comment on any matter brought to its attention.

The Agenda for the first LISAC meeting shows that the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 was an item for comment (LIS Corporate Record, 1992f). In the papers for that meeting was a summary of the major strategic thrusts (later to be called LIS Key Result Areas) of Quality Client Service, Education, Information Technology, Collection/Information Access, Staff and Strategic Alliance.
Over the years of the LIS strategic planning process the University Librarian reported consistently to each LISAC meeting through her *ULs Information Updates* on matters of importance flowing from the LIS Strategic Plan. The record of the twice-yearly LISAC meetings provides a valuable source to monitor progress of specific projects and actions within the LIS Strategic Plan and against each of the LIS Key Result Areas within the plan.

**Christmas - New Year**

The period from the end of second semester through until the start of a new academic year in February is traditionally a quiet time within universities. The LIS corporate records confirm this as the case for LIS staff in relation to their strategic planning process during December 1992 and January 1993. Nevertheless, by February 1993 events and activities related to the LIS change process were again underway.

**The 1993 Senior Staff Retreat**

On 2 and 3 February 1993, an activity, which was to become an annual and significant event in the LIS strategic planning process, was held for the first time. A senior staff seminar, under the banner of *Meeting the Challenge*, was held at the Notre Dame University in Fremantle (LIS Corporate Record, 1993c). In later years this activity was to become known as the annual Senior Management Team (SMT) Planning Retreat. It continued to be held in various locations and with various participants to reflect the changing LIS organizational structure every year since 1993. A consultant from Bandt Gatter and Associates, a strategic planning and training company, facilitated the first seminar and this same consultant has continued an association with the LIS strategic planning process every year since.

The 1993 Senior Staff Retreat involved the University Librarian and the 3 senior staff (the Deputy University Librarian, the Technical Services Librarian
and the Public Services Librarian). By the beginning of 1993 some internal restructuring had seen the appointment of a Deputy University Librarian and the abolition of the position of Management Services Librarian. The objectives of the 1993 Senior Staff seminar were:

1. To enhance the development of the LIS Management Team.
2. To establish the critical priorities for the LIS for the next 2-3 years.
3. To establish a plan for the strategic and operational management of the LIS.
4. To establish the way in which the Management Team wishes to lead the LIS into the future and manage any necessary change (LIS Corporate Record, 1993b).

The 1993 retreat produced some refinements to the process of managing the strategic plan, such as streamlining of the planning documentation, which by the beginning of 1993 had grown voluminous. It more tightly defined the terminology used in the strategic planning process and established a planning structure in keeping with the deliberations of the Decision Conference (LIS Corporate Record, 1993c).

SMT also began to align the activities of the strategic planning process more closely with the academic year (March to November) and library funding cycle (January to December). In making these changes the SMT kept faith with the shared vision articulated through the Decision Conference. In one sense the SMT were working in a vacuum because the University as a whole had no strategic planning framework, and therefore the LIS staff were the only group on campus using a strategic planning process. The LIS staff were therefore very innovative in their approach to strategic planning.
The SMT developed a planning grid or template to monitor and track progress with strategic projects and initiatives. Dozens of copies of many different versions of this grid dominate the corporate records (LIS Corporate Record, 1993a; LIS Corporate Record, 1993c). Almost all are undated, and given the disarray of the corporate records, it was almost impossible to distinguish which grid corresponded with which particular component of the LIS Strategic Planning Cycle. Nevertheless, the development of this grid and its refinement over time shows evidence of the growing confidence and maturity of the planning process and its management. Clearly, the LIS staff were developing planning skills along the way as they developed and refined the particulars of the process.

SMT also determined more precisely the roles and responsibility of the various groups who had become involved in the strategic planning process. For example, the SMT determined they would make it a practice to meet formally once a fortnight - a practice that continued over the years. They developed Terms of Reference for SMT meetings, kept meeting minutes and circulated information about their discussions to LIS staff. The terms of reference established for SMT meetings were to:

- Ensure a corporate approach to the management of the LIS.
- Meet formally as a senior management team.
- Monitor operational demands and ensure that resources are used in accordance with determined strategic directions.
- Keep each other briefed about LIS activities.
- Share information and ensure communication.
- Keep each other briefed about developments within the university, the profession and the higher education sector, especially those likely to impact on LIS operations.
Monitor and review progress or otherwise with the LIS strategic planning process (LIS Corporate Record, 1993f).

The SMT standard generic agenda, including an item called “Planning Update”, was developed. The Planning Update agenda item was considered at every second meeting and therefore the minutes of the SMT meetings provide a detailed record of the progress made with action plans and projects flowing from the LIS Strategic Plan. Around the same time the University Librarian set terms of reference, a generic agenda and a schedule of quarterly meeting dates and times which for the first time brought together in a formal meeting setting the Section Heads and the University Librarian.

The role of the Research and Development (R & D) Librarian was also clarified by the University Librarian at the beginning of 1993 (LIS Corporate Record, 1993d). The R & D Librarian had de facto been the officer with carriage of much of the administrative detail of the strategic planning process (e.g. documentation, record keeping and co-ordination of projects). During 1993 the R & D Librarian continued a close administrative association with the strategic planning process including attending meetings about strategic projects and reporting regularly at SMT meetings about progress.

Two features from the earlier sequences of events and activities continued. In particular, there were a number of initiatives to help improve internal communications. For example, a LIS staff newsletter was eventually set up. There were also initiatives to help LIS staff keep in touch with industry and related external developments. For example, an internal current awareness and alerting service (known as CUTLIS Cuts) was developed by the R & D Librarian. The University Librarian established the practice of inviting visiting guests to speak to LIS staff about current and emerging issues in professional
practice through the *ULs Lunchtime Forum* series. These initiatives highlighted the continuing emphasis placed on environmental scanning.

**Industry developments**

LIS staff continued to monitor developments in the external environment, and environmental scanning became an important, accepted and recognized responsibility for all senior staff.

While the LIS staff continued working to bring about change in line with their stated desired future, the end of the first year of their change process was dominated in industry terms by a significant external event. In April 1993 a major invitation-only conference *Changes in scholarly communication patterns: Australia and the electronic library* was held in Canberra (Mulvaney & Steele, 1993). The Curtin University Vice-Chancellor requested the University Librarian to represent the institution on his behalf.

The significance of this industry forum was greatly boosted by an announcement by the Federal Minister at the opening session of a Government Infrastructure Grant of $5 million to support the development of system wide national infrastructure for libraries to improve the delivery of scholarly information. This grant was not only a sector-wide boost, but it also helped to validate for the LIS staff the importance of their change process and the value of their strategic planning approach. It was now more evident to LIS staff that their change process had begun to place the LIS in a strong position to benefit from national developments.

In her report to the Vice-Chancellor on the Conference the University Librarian noted:

> The timing of the Conference was significant, following closely after the recent federal election. Together with the Federal Government’s 1990 Review of Higher Education Libraries (the Ross Report), the Conference
is likely to go down as a significant milestone in the history and development of Australian Academic Libraries in the 1990s (LIS Corporate Record, 1993e).

ROUTINIZATION OF THE LIS STRATEGIC PLANNING CYCLE

The planning cycle clarified and established

By the end of April 1993 – exactly one year after the University Librarian’s announcement that “there will be a formalized planning and policy development process” many activities and key events had taken place. Nevertheless, by April 1993 it is evident from the LIS corporate records that many strategic planning activities and events began to be repeated as the LIS staff moved to operationalize their plan. By then, also, LIS staff were heavily involved in work on major projects which in some cases, such as acquiring a new library automation system and replanning and refurbishing the library building, would take them some years to achieve.

In the only published account of the LIS strategic planning process, written some years after the commencement of the process, some interesting features of the LIS Strategic Planning Cycle were noted (Exon, 1995 p. 233). According to this analysis the LIS Strategic Planning Cycle had the following features:

- It began in 1992 with the appointment of a new University Librarian.
- It began with a series of carefully chosen consciousness-raising training experiences to help develop a strategic plan.
- Over time it became dominated by specific projects (such as the project to replace the library’s computer system, which took several years to complete).
- It contained some review mechanisms (such as Program Review undertaken in 1995).
- The annual Senior Management Team Retreat became important in the cycle as it provided the opportunity to annually review the past year, and set priorities for the coming year.
Throughout, the integrity of the original plan and the LIS commitment to open, participative management is honoured.

The Plan has remained flexible.

In the introduction to the 1994 public version of the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000*, the University Librarian recalled the events of 1992 and noted:

Since August 1992 the Plan had received considerable support and recognition from the University’s Executive Management, our clients and client groups. We have achieved considerable progress and the LIS is moving closer towards the realization of its vision. We have done this at a time of significant resource constraints and change within the library and information industry and through consistent, focused and dedicated hard work from all LIS staff. Through an on-going commitment to continuous improvement and the provision of quality client services, LIS staff have achieved much in a relatively short space of time.

We have come a long way, but further work remains! (LIS Corporate Record, 1994).

In summary, the LIS Strategic Planning Cycle as it had emerged after the first year is presented in Table 4.9.
Table 4.9: The LIS Planning Cycle after one Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SMT Planning Retreat</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes &amp; Accountabilities - LISAC, Annual Reports etc</td>
<td>Annual priority projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMT Meetings</td>
<td>monitor progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/Actions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This chapter presents the analysis of the data from the study.

The analyses are presented in order of the research questions underpinning the study, which were listed in chapter 1. The specific research questions underpinning the study were within LIS:

- What key organizational factors help to shape the organization’s response to innovation?
- To what extent do the characteristics of the context of change, expressed in terms of setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions, influence the adoption of the innovation and the nature and extent of the change process?
- What key organizational processes help ensure the successful adoption of an innovation?
- Within a strategic planning process how critical is the articulation of a shared vision for driving change in professional practice?
- What particular processes help to ensure a shared vision?

The analyses are also presented in terms of the innovation and change framework. The findings emerged by applying the innovation and change framework presented in chapter 2 to the particular circumstances and characteristics of the LIS case as outlined in chapter 4. In particular, the findings are presented in terms of the dimensions of the innovation and change framework and discussed in terms of the change process as:

- adoption dominated;
- a move towards a learning organization;
- through the characteristics of the context of change
- other factors influencing change.
Key organizational factors shaping the response to innovation

From the analysis of data it is evident that an array of factors were influential in shaping the LIS staff response to the innovation of strategic planning. These factors were diverse and frequently interrelated. Nevertheless, there is compelling evidence, especially from the desired future statements developed during the Decision Conference, to support the conclusion that one of the most significant factors shaping the LIS response to the innovation of strategic planning was the LIS staff capacity to develop and give commitment to a shared vision for the future of LIS as a learning organization.

LIS staff were successful in drawing together a broad range of views about a desired future state which emerged during the months prior to the Decision Conference in August 1992. Through the extensive preparations and final discussions LIS staff were able to determine a consensus view about their desired future state. The desired future statements which emerged from the Decision Conference were the first articulation of this shared vision and became the basis of the vision statement which was an integral part of the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000*.

From the time of the Decision Conference onwards, the vision was not merely that of the leader, but was the collective and shared vision of the LIS staff. That vision was to guide the actions taken by LIS staff in the years following the Decision Conference. Beyond the Decision Conference there were many mechanisms put in place to engender understanding, appreciation and on-going commitment to the shared vision. For example, the practice of the University Librarian to visit and talk with sections and work teams on a regular basis and the attention paid to the induction of new staff. Staff induction was one of the
three issues to receive attention from an internal working party established after the Decision Conference.

The desired future statements, previously presented in Table 4.5, when viewed collectively provide strong evidence that the shared vision of LIS staff was that they wanted LIS to become a learning organization. This conclusion is drawn because the desired future statements correspond with and highlight the various definitions and descriptions of a learning organization. Looking more closely at the desired future statements shows how this vision to be a learning organization was viewed by LIS staff and especially how it was expressed.

There is evidence to show that other factors were also influential in shaping the LIS staff response to the innovation of strategic planning. This evidence is found in the events and activities of the strategic planning process. For example, the arrival of a new University Librarian and the role she played in the strategic planning process, the various opportunities afforded to all levels of LIS staff to be involved, and the selective use of the skills and expertise of others, outside of the immediate LIS staff. All of these factors and others were influential.

The new University Librarian wasted no time in declaring a vision about the future of LIS. She expressed her views on several occasions and publicly to LIS staff during the course of the recruitment process for the position of University Librarian, and upon taking up her appointment through various staff meetings and addresses. From the position of being the leader of LIS and her commitment to the process of strategic planning, the University Librarian and the role she played in the process was a key factor shaping the response to the innovation.
The opportunities afforded to and taken up by LIS staff to be involved in the strategic planning process was also an influential factor. In the case of some LIS staff, involvement was through the MeetingWare sessions and for other LIS staff it was by being directly involved in the Decision Conference. However, as the strategic planning process moved through its cycle, the opportunities for involvement continued to widen. New ways of working together were emerging and new opportunities for LIS staff involvement were evident. Opportunities included events and activities such as, membership of specialist working parties (e.g. the Working Party on Internal Communication), project work associated with the action plans (e.g. the project to prepare a Request for Information for an integrated computer system) and interactions with new strategic alliance partners (e.g. with collaborative projects undertaken by the Western Australian Group of University Librarians).

The involvement of selected people from outside of LIS also appears to have been a key organizational factor shaping the LIS staff response to the innovation of strategic planning. Consultants (such as those from the Division of Business and Administration; AIMA and Bandt, Gatter and Associates) played important roles at various stages of the strategic planning process. For example, it was the advice from the Division of Business and Administration consultants which led to the University Librarian’s decision to use decision conferencing as the mechanism to help formulate a strategic plan. Also, the fact that the consultant from Bandt, Gatter and Associates continued an association with the LIS staff and the strategic planning process beyond the first cycle of the process shows how the involvement of selected consultants was an influential factor.

There is supporting evidence, particularly from the events and activities of the strategic planning process, to show how factors as diverse as the role of the leader and the part played by consultants were key factors in shaping the LIS staff response to the innovation of strategic planning. However, the evidence is
strongest in relation to the claim that it was the LIS staff shared vision to recreate their organization as a learning organization which was perhaps the single most significant factor in shaping their response to the innovation of strategic planning.

Characteristics of the context of change

The characteristics of the context of change, expressed in terms of setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions, were all influential in the adoption of the innovation and the nature and extent of the change process. Many times these characteristics merged in the course of the various events and activities of the strategic planning process. For example, the visit by the AIMA consultant and her conduct of the AIMA workshops not only brought influences of the setting of the wider library and information industry to the context of the LIS staff strategic planning, but it also introduced LIS staff to an influential person (an actor) and some of her views (issues). During the course of the AIMA workshops, LIS staff debated issues and developed some scenarios for possible action. Accordingly, the events and the activities of the LIS strategic planning process show many instances of how the characteristics of the context, expressed through the setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions, influenced the adoption of the innovation and the nature and extent of the change process.

During the course of the LIS strategic planning process both the broad setting and the specific scene influenced the nature and extent of the change process. While LIS staff were well aware of the immediate context in which LIS operated, the strategic planning process brought a heightened awareness of the world beyond LIS. During the course of the change process a lot of attention was paid to the various settings (or locations) in which their planning was taking place. LIS staff were well briefed about developments in the context of the
world outside of LIS – the world of the Curtin University of Technology, of higher education and the library and information industry.

For example, environmental scanning became important and the University Librarian encouraged LIS staff to inform themselves about developments by reading widely, especially the professional literature of librarianship. As the strategic planning process matured and evolved, examples of how LIS staff kept abreast of developments are evident. For example, there were initiatives such as the UL’s Lunchtime Forums, where invited speakers were brought in to talk to LIS staff about current developments, either within the university (for example, the current research profile of the School of Chemistry), the higher education sector (for example, new award provisions for general staff) or the library and information industry (for example, recent research about the information seeking behaviors of university staff using the Internet).

People and their interactions feature heavily in the events and activities of the LIS strategic planning process. There are many, many examples of interactions between the LIS staff. For example, an important early interaction was the mixing of staff from different sections and across different classification levels at the AIMA workshops in June 1992. The interactions of LIS staff were critical to the debate and discussions which culminated in the Decision Conference and the compilation of the LIS Strategic Plan.

There was also evidence from the early stages of the strategic planning process of the involvement of people outside of the LIS organization. For example, there were visits to LIS staff meetings by other specialist University staff (the Academic Registrar, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor - Research and Development); LIS used consultants, some from within the university (academic staff from the Division of Business and Administration) and some external to the university (AIMA and Bandt, Gatter and Associates).
Nevertheless, the strategic planning process was well and truly driven from within LIS, by the LIS staff themselves. The change process was not mandated by an external authority (either within the university or external to the university). Therefore, the setting and scene were important in so far as the LIS staff were cognizant of the location in which the planning was taking place.

Issues, too, were important and during the course of the LIS strategic planning process many issues arose, which were debated by LIS staff. One such issue was that of the virtual library or the library of the future where information would be in electronic form and the days of printed books would be a thing of the past. LIS staff were well acquainted with the various issues underpinning some of the emerging talk about the possibilities promised by the new and emerging communication and information technology. During the course of the strategic planning process LIS staff formed views about the electronic library and other issues and eventually developed a shared vision about how LIS staff would tackle these in the desired future state. In this context it is not insignificant that both information technology and information access featured strongly as strategic thrusts in the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000*.

However, the actors (or LIS staff, sometimes in association with others) involved in bringing about change were an important component of the characteristics of the context which was significant in the LIS case. After all, it was the LIS staff which conceptualized, initiated and carried out the strategic planning process. It was LIS staff who debated the scenarios, against the other contextual factors of the setting and scene. It was LIS staff who the decided actions to be taken, and it was LIS staff who eventually carried the actions through priority projects, some of which took many years to realize.
For example, LIS staff recognized very early on that a major action needed was to acquire an integrated computer system. This in itself was a huge and potentially costly action. Nevertheless, LIS staff used the computer modelling of the Decision Conference to agree that it was a vital and strategically important action. It was to take the LIS staff several years to acquire, install and turn on the system for client use. However, at no stage did the LIS staff ever relent from the strategic decision taken at the Decision Conference that acquiring an integrated system was central to their shared vision of the future.

**Key organizational processes helping to ensure successful adoption**

From the analysis of data it is evident that the mechanism of going through and participating in the Decision Conference (including the MeetingWare sessions), was a key organizational process which helped ensure successful adoption of the innovation of strategic planning. In particular, the events and activities leading up to the Decision Conference and the Decision Conference itself seem critical. Certainly, the documentation from the Decision Conference and the level of detail contained in that documentation helps to confirm this conclusion.

There was considerable time and effort devoted to preparing for the Decision Conference, with efforts extended over the months of May, June and July 1992. The various lead-up events and activities prior to the Decision Conference were designed to engage the LIS staff, and the involvement of all levels of LIS staff was actively supported and encouraged. Staff appeared willing to participate in extra activities while continuing to meet the demands of their day-to-day jobs. MeetingWare sessions were admittedly held in work time, but LIS staff somehow managed to maintain opening hours and services.

**The articulation of a shared vision**

Within the strategic planning process, the articulation of a shared vision was important for driving the change in professional practice of the LIS staff.
because it was this articulation which was transformed into specific actions within the LIS strategic plan. This conclusion is supported by a range of evidence from the events and activities of the LIS strategic planning process.

For example, early on, even during the recruitment phase of the selection process for University Librarian, the University Librarian spoke of the importance of knowing and agreeing on who are the LIS customers, what activities LIS undertakes, what are the inputs and outputs, how LIS is perceived by others, who owns LIS and what are the constraints under which LIS works. The University Librarian reinforced this same message in her inaugural address to LIS staff, and her written communication to LIS staff during the lead-up to the Decision Conference reinforced the need to develop a shared vision of the desired future state.

Perhaps the most telling evidence of the importance of articulating the shared vision comes by way of confirmation from the University Librarian after the Decision Conference. The University Librarian’s confirmation to LIS staff in a post Decision Conference communiqué, about how impressed she was at the speed with which the Decision Conference participants became committed to the shared vision and its implementation, was significant.

The shared vision of the LIS as a learning organization was a key factor in the successful adoption of the innovation of strategic planning within LIS; and articulation of the shared vision helped to explain the nature and extent of the change in the professional practice of the LIS staff and, eventually, also to LIS clients.

The rally cry or motto of “Helping our clients navigate the information universe” came to symbolize the LIS shared vision, and it came to be used on
library handouts and ephemeral materials as something of an outward sign to LIS clients about the changes under way.

Processes to ensure a shared vision
From the events and activities of the strategic planning process, there is evidence of a number of processes used to ensure a shared vision. The importance of both the MeetingWare sessions and the Decision Conference has previously been noted. However, the significance of both these events and activities cannot be underestimated. The real influence of these two events was that LIS staff had direct opportunities for input. The shared nature of the vision and the collective ownership of the vision came from the engagement and participation of LIS staff in these events and activities.

However, beyond the Decision Conference, the importance placed on improving internal communication was vital. The working party, established after the Decision Conference to make recommendations about improving internal communication, made a number of significant recommendations in their first report presented in December 1992 (LIS Corporate Record, 1992b).

A range of communication techniques were also used to ensure a shared vision. Much of this communication was generated by the University Librarian, and her technique of addressing memos and letters directly to LIS staff (rather than through section heads or supervisors) was used on several occasions during the first year or so of the LIS strategic planning process. The distribution of such memos and letters, by attaching them to LIS staff payslips, appeared to be used as a way of ensuring that important information got directly to the individual staff and was not filtered through a supervisor or other agent. In this respect communication about the shared vision and the change process generally became very personalized and direct.
In relation to the specific research questions, the study provided evidence that:

- While an array of organizational factors were influential in shaping the LIS response to the innovation of strategic planning, there is strong evidence to support the conclusion that the capacity of LIS staff to develop and give commitment to a shared vision for the future of LIS as a learning organization was the key organizational factor which shaped the LIS response to strategic planning.

- While the scene/setting, actors, scenarios, issues and actions, representing the characteristics of the context of change, all influenced the adoption of the innovation and the nature and extent of the change process, there is strong evidence to support the conclusion that the LIS staff themselves, both individually and collectively, were the most influential.

- The process of the Decision Conference (including the MeetingWare sessions), was a key organizational process which helped ensure the successful adoption of the innovation of strategic planning. Expressed more broadly, it was the processes that engaged and involved the LIS staff which were the key organizational processes which helped ensure the successful adoption of the innovation of strategic planning. In these terms, the Decision Conference was the most obvious example of a key organizational process that engaged and involved the people most critical to the successful adoption of the innovation of strategic planning.

- Within the strategic planning process, the attention paid to internal communication and the various communication mechanisms used to articulate the shared vision were critical for driving change in the professional practice of the LIS staff.

- Opportunities for LIS staff input and engagement, and attention to internal communication helped to ensure a shared vision.
The change process as adoption-dominated
There is no doubt that the arrival of a new University Librarian in April 1992 was the single most obvious and outward sign that change had begun within the LIS. The language used in her inaugural address to LIS staff, the titling of the address *The Coming of Change* as well as her announcements about the establishment of a formal planning process provide evidence to support this claim.

In strict theoretical terms the adoption phase (or process that leads up to and includes a decision to adopt or proceed with a change) of the innovation had taken place, by virtue of the fact that the University Librarian had taken the decision to establish a formal planning process. She had announced this decision at the LIS staff meetings held on 30 April and 1 May. However in the LIS case, adoption may not have been as clear-cut. It was to take the LIS staff several more months (through May to August 1992) and involvement in several significant sub-processes before the nature and extent of the change to their professional practice was defined in the first instance through the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000*.

Strategic planning in the formal sense was not undertaken until the Decision Conference in August 1992. Even then, specific actions to commence the implementation of the LIS Strategic Plan, and thus to effect the actual change to professional practice, was not commenced until later in the year of 1992 and only really began in earnest after the February 1993 SMT Retreat. From September to December 1992 some attention was paid to contextual issues, such as improving internal communication. Nevertheless, it was not until after the February SMT Retreat, when the senior managers had discussed and considered the resource implications, that action (or priority projects) to begin the implementations of the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 were approved for implementation.
Given the long lead time and the diverse range of events and activities engaged in by the LIS staff prior to the formal compilation of the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000, it is more appropriate to view the adoption phase as lasting beyond the arrival of a new University Librarian and her announcements about establishing a formal planning process. Indeed, the implementation phase really only began when LIS staff initiated specific actions to commence the implementation of the LIS strategic plan.

Adopting this view means that in theoretical terms the events and activities of the LIS strategic planning process during 1992 and into 1993 are best considered in terms of a start-up, a beginning, or as Fullan (1991) would call it, an initiation process within the adoption phase of the innovation. In the LIS case, therefore, the adoption phase was like that of the planning stage (Miles, 1978), the proposal generation stage (Daft & Becker, 1978) and the readiness stage (Rosenblum & Louis, 1981), which were previously discussed in Chapter 2. This view of the LIS adoption phase supports the finding that the change triggered by the introduction within the LIS of a strategic planning process was adoption-dominated. As indicated in Chapter 2, the literature abounds with studies about how change is implemented, as change has tended to be viewed as implementation-dominated. The finding from this study is therefore somewhat in contrast with the majority of available literature in this field.

Even recognizing that inflexibility of definitions sometimes makes it difficult to state precisely when the adoption phase ends and the implementation phase begins, there were many events and activities undertaken by the LIS staff which show a somewhat unusual and lengthy adoption period. Within these events and activities it is also easy to identify particular events and activities that were designed to help the LIS staff to mobilize and prepare for change. For example, the AIMA Workshops and information sessions by key University staff, such as
the Academic Registrar and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research and Development).

Although formal strategic planning had not commenced, nevertheless, these same events and activities were already effecting some change and impacting on the LIS staff. For example, attendance by senior staff at the industry forum: *Confronting the future: university libraries in the next decade* was linking LIS staff to the wider external environment, bringing them into contact with new and emerging ideas about scholarly communication and the challenges faced by university libraries.

The frequent and detailed communications issued by the University Librarian show evidence of a desire to inform the LIS staff about possible change while also signalling a new management practice of keeping staff informed. These communications (whole of LIS staff meetings, individual letters to staff, etc) stand somewhat in contrast to some of the statements used by LIS staff in the MeetingWare sessions devoted to the topic of channels of communication to describe their desired future state. For example, statements such as “ensure staff are told about things that effect them” (p. 30), “meetings of all library staff on a regular basis” (p. 29) and “ensure staff are told about things that effect them” (p. 29). While some small change had already begun, LIS staff through the MeetingWare sessions were not only reflecting on past experience but also confirming their desired future state.

In the LIS case therefore, the adoption phase appears to have extended well beyond the single step of the arrival of a new University Librarian and the decision to adopt a formal planning process. Adoption in the LIS case involved other things. It involved spending time to define and articulate a shared vision and to articulate that desired future state through a strategic plan. Only after that was done, did LIS staff begin to think about implementation.
The change process as a move towards a learning organization

The innovation and change framework helps to unpack the change process by viewing the change process in terms of the various dimensions of the innovation and change framework.

In terms of the generic innovation and change framework presented in Table 2.3, by going through and participating in the Decision Conference (including the MeetingWare sessions), LIS staff were thinking about, planning and, more importantly, articulating and conceiving the nature and extent of the change they desired in terms of the four organizational categories in the generic innovation and change framework. LIS staff were reflecting about their organization generally and, in the terms of the organizational categories within the innovation and change framework, LIS staff were working through the components of the knowing, understanding, thinking and learning organization. They were defining more precisely their desired future state as a move towards being a learning organization.

In addition, LIS staff were also planning how this would be implemented through change to the LIS professional practice, as viewed through the five professional practice components of the generic innovation and change framework presented in Table 2.3. Change was being planned to LIS philosophy, management practices, employees, customers and capacity to handle change. In doing so over an extended period, through a pre-initiation phase within the adoption phase, LIS staff were beginning in some small way to act out or effect the desired change.

During the course of the MeetingWare sessions LIS staff were not required to define the current state of the LIS organization. Indeed, the focus for the MeetingWare sessions, including topics like “the ideal library” (pp. 57-62,
71-85), were deliberately planned around themes or topics which required the participants to think about the future. Nevertheless, participant responses to these themes and topics sometimes used language which showed they were often describing the future in terms of it being the reverse of what they perceived to be the current situation. Therefore, with much of the data from the MeetingWare sessions, it required the researcher to place this meaning over the data, in order to make sense of what was happening. Accordingly, while it was beyond the scope of this study to establish exactly the organizational state of LIS before the change, the data does provide some insights into this and gives some limited scope to make tentative judgments about this.

The generic innovation and change framework can be tailored to assist with further analysis of the LIS case and used to confirm findings about the LIS case in respect to various dimensions of the innovation and change framework.

Table 5.1 presents the innovation and change framework tailored to take account of the LIS case. Accordingly, the LIS innovation and change framework shows the organizational category of the learning organization taken from the generic innovation and change framework in Table 2.3 in alignment with the desired future statements previously listed in Table 4.5. This tailored innovation and change framework is a powerful analysis and shows clearly and concisely the particulars of the LIS case. Therefore, in overview, the LIS innovation and change framework shows clearly that the nature of the desired change, which LIS staff were seeking to effect through their strategic planning process, was to move LIS towards being a learning organization.

In the LIS case, sometimes slightly different terminology was used; for example, LIS staff used the term staff instead of employee and clients instead of customers.
Table 5.1: The LIS innovation and change framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Learning</th>
<th>LIS as a Learning Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PHILOSOPHY</td>
<td>Examine, enhance and improve every business experience, including how we experience.</td>
<td>User would gain ready access from where ever they are, to information and documents at the time of need through the services that we offer. We have collections that are well targeted to meet the needs of the client base. Efficient document (including digital documentation) delivery. We have state of the art automated systems for internal operations and access to information both internal and external. We cater for the specific needs of different user groups. We are proud of our building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANAGEMENT PRACTICES</td>
<td>Encourage experiments, facilitate examination, promote constructive dissent, model learning and acknowledge failure.</td>
<td>Dynamic leadership Adequate resources to achieve desired goals We have a defined focus and set of goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>Gather and use information; constructive dissent.</td>
<td>Accessible skilled, approachable and innovative staff Staff are up-to-date with the most recent and appropriate technology We have a reputation such that people want to work within the organization The staff will have a high professional reputation An environment that allows staff to grow personally and professionally The library environment provides stimulating work Effective communication channels within the library and the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUSTOMERS</td>
<td>Are part of a teaching/learning relationship, with open and continuous dialogue</td>
<td>Client focus/quality service culture Essential to and integrated with the University’s programs We are highly valued by our users Librarians valued as teachers of information literacy We are recognized as a key player in university policy formulation and resource allocation Librarians valued as effective navigators of the information universe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE</td>
<td>Part of the continuous process of experience – examine – hypothesize – experiment – experience</td>
<td>The library is regarded internationally as a model of excellence within a specific area We are a dynamic organization that is flexible enough to respond to changing needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LIS STRATEGIC PLANNING PROCESS

(LIS Strategic Plan 1992 – 2000)

Settings/scenes: Curtin LIS – Library Industry Curtin University of Technology – Higher Education
Actors: University Librarian, Senior Staff, LIS Staff and Clients
Scenarios: The Learning Organization or other
Issues: Strategic thrusts (KRA’s)
Actions: Annual priority projects
During both the MeetingWare sessions and the Decision Conference itself, LIS staff were clarifying and determining where the LIS was at organizationally. This was, in effect, part of the wider process of determining a desired future state for LIS. In part, the LIS staff were identifying their current state along the organizational categories of the framework - that is, along the continuum from knowing, through understanding, thinking and towards a learning organization. The “Now Situation” statements (pp. 21-22) and the MeetingWare input (pp. 27-83) from the Decision Conference Report help to give some indication of this. However, given the way that the data was originally collected, and its emphasis on the future desired state, there is insufficient evidence to support a clear determination or firm conclusion about exactly where on this grid LIS was placed before the commencement of the strategic planning process.

Nevertheless, some statements tend to suggest that the LIS was at the “knowing” end of the continuum. For instance, in respect to the “customers” category of the grid, some statements when read in context support the notion that LIS was at the knowing end of the continuum, in that the prevailing LIS attitude towards customers was one that customers must believe the company knows best. For example, LIS staff at the MeetingWare sessions made statements such as “flexible application of library rules” (p. 33) and “library to consider the needs/wants of academic staff and students” (p. 39) to describe the ideal situation for quality client service in the future. While during the course of the analysis of the “Now Situation” at the Decision Conference it was noted: “There is tension between the library and the academic community due to the academic community’s wants not being fully satisfied” (p. 22).

While it is not possible to be conclusive about where on the continuum from knowledge to learning the LIS staff viewed the current state of their organization at the start of its strategic planning process, there is ample evidence to show where LIS staff wanted to be in the future – namely, to be a
learning organization. The LIS staff desired future statements show that they were projecting toward the learning end of the continuum, although it is very significant that LIS staff did not use this terminology or indeed the words the learning organization at any stage of the LIS strategic planning process. The terminology of the learning organization does not appear in any of the LIS corporate records. However, there is evidence to show that at least the University Librarian was knowledgeable about the subject, as in 1993 she used the terminology and concept of the learning organization in published professional writing (Pattison & Williamson, 1993).

Through the strategic planning process LIS staff were identifying their preferred option for the future development of LIS as an organization and planning dramatic change in their professional practice. In due course the care and time devoted to the wording of the LIS strategic thrusts (areas of focus or key result areas) and the vision statement reflected this. In particular, the words in the vision statement were to highlight several of the features of a learning organization. In particular, there is an obvious emphasis on aspects to do with philosophy, employees and customers. For example, the desire to be “client-focused”, providing “ready and timely access to information, including efficient document delivery” shows a strong commitment to a new philosophy of professional practice. The desire to be “a source of pride to its staff, to Curtin University, and to the library and information industry” demonstrates the characteristic of both employees and customers as part of a teaching and learning relationship, another characteristic of the learning organization.

Through the strategic planning process, the LIS staff planned significant change in the philosophy underpinning their professional practice. The nature and extent of that planned change can be summarized using industry terminology adopted in 1995 to describe those areas of professional practice where employees working in the library and information sector need to be
competent (Williamson & White, 1996). This terminology was working with information, working with clients and working with others. Using this terminology helps to show clearly that the change in philosophy had to do with the way LIS staff would be working with information (“using technology to access and deliver information, irrespective of location or format”); working with clients (“addressing the information needs of the Curtin community”); and working with others (“building internal and external relationships with individuals, groups and institutions” and “ensuring professional and personal development for employees, an attractive work environment and flexible work options”).

In respect to working with information, the strategic planning process signalled a move away from a total reliance on in-house collections towards a mix of in-house collections and remote electronic sources. In industry terms LIS was moving from a “just in case library” to a “just in time library” (Buckland, 1992). In terms of how LIS staff viewed this move, the statements from the Decision Conference that “users would gain ready access from wherever they are, to information and documents at the time of need through the services that we offer” is not insignificant (p. 23).

The focus (or key result area) on collection/information access (defined in the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 as “providing relevant in-house collections and identifying, locating and accessing remote sources”) helped signal the extent of this change. The strategy statement to “develop a comprehensive, targeted and responsive collection development, information access and document delivery programme” (p. 3) also highlights the profound change desired in relation to the philosophy of the LIS and how it would go about working with information.

The LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 marked significant change in relation to how LIS approached and worked with clients. The focus (or key result area) of
quality client service (defined in the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 as “addressing the information needs of the Curtin community”) helped indicate the extent of this change. The strategy statement of “a major emphasis on client service, involving a systematic evaluation of client requirements and attention to all aspects of internal and external marketing” (p. 3) also highlights the profound change desired in relation to the philosophy of the LIS and how it would go about working with clients. In this context, too, the focus on education (defined in the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 as “providing information literacy skills for life-long learning”) was also important to emphasize the extent of the change in philosophy within the LIS.

The LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 also marked significant change in relation to how LIS staff would be working with others – either internally with each other and/or in partnership with others both within and external to the university. The focus (or key result area) of Staff (defined in the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 as “ensuring professional and personal development for employees, an attractive work environment and flexible work options”) helped signal the extent of this change. Also the focus (or key result area) of Strategic Alliances (defined in the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 as “building internal and external relationships with individuals, groups and institutions”) was important in this context. The strategy statement of “a focus on our human resources, especially training and development, the working environment and flexible work options” (p. 3) also highlights the profound change desired in relation to the philosophy of the LIS and how it would go about working with others.

It emerged from the Decision Conference that LIS staff were keen to change management practices. In particular, LIS staff wanted a different style of leadership in their desired future state. The change was toward “dynamic leadership”, clarity about available resources (“adequate resources to achieve
desired goals”) and being clear about the focus and the goals of LIS (“we have a
defined focus and set of goals”) (pp. 23-24).

There is also evidence from the MeetingWare sessions to support the finding
that change in management practices would result from the strategic planning
process. This evidence is found not only in the LIS staff MeetingWare sessions
but also from the client (academic staff and student) MeetingWare session. For
example, there was reference to “efficient administration” (p. 79) made during
the client MeetingWare session. Meantime LIS staff wanted “management to
be receptive to new ideas” (p. 68), “staff and management willing to participate
in innovative programs” (p. 68), “sufficient resources” (p. 68), “effective
leadership” (p. 63) and “management staff show a genuine interest in all levels
of work” (p. 58).

The LIS staff or employees in the broadest sense were critical players in the LIS
strategic planning process and there is an almost totally overwhelming sense
that in the LIS desired future state, staff would be critical. There are numerous
and highly descriptive statements from both the MeetingWare sessions and the
Decision Conference about how staff would operate and work in the desired
future state of LIS as a learning organization and how the LIS staff professional
practice would change as a result.

For example, within the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000, there is a strong
emphasis on matters of concern to LIS staff, such as training and development.
References to ensuring both “professional and personal development…an
attractive work environment and flexible work options” are consistent
throughout the plan. The concern or focus on LIS staff is also emphasized
through desired future statement such as “accessible skilled, approachable and
innovative staff” (p. 23), “staff are up-to-date with the most recent and
appropriate technology” (p. 23), “we have a reputation such that people want to
work within the organization” (p. 24), “the staff will have a high professional reputation” (p. 24), “an environment that allows staff to grow personally and professionally” (p. 24), “the library environment provides stimulating work” (p. 24) and “effective communication channels within the library and the university” (p. 24).

The focus on staff also found realization in several of the actions identified within the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000*, such as “develop a comprehensive human resources management plan”, “improve internal communications” and “create flexible working structure for its staff”.

Evidence that LIS staff were planning change in relation to the employee dimension of the LIS organization was evidenced by the early establishment of the working parties to focus on the staff issues. A feature of these working parties on internal communication, staff induction and flexible working options was that they would gather and use information and present constructive alternatives to move the issues forward.

A characteristic of a learning organization is its capacity to view customers (or clients in the LIS case) as part of a teaching/learning relationship, with open and continuous dialogue. There was great emphasis placed on clients and service to clients in the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000*. A number of desired future statements help to show evidence of the LIS staff commitment to a new and somewhat enlightened partnership with clients. For example, statements such as “client focus/quality service culture” (p. 23), “essential to and integrated with the University’s programs” (p. 23), “we are highly valued by our users” (p. 23), “librarians valued as teachers of information literacy” (p. 23), “we are recognized as a key player in university policy formulation and resource allocation” (p. 24) and “librarians valued as effective navigators of the information universe” (p. 24).
Backing the aspiration for closer contact with clients was the first formal meeting of the advisory committee (LISAC) on 16 November 1992, where the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000* was presented and explained (LIS Corporate Record, 1992f).

While LIS staff were cognizant that change was underway, they wanted to improve their **capacity to handle change** and there is evidence, again from the Decision Conference and the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000*, to support this. For example, in the desired future state, LIS staff would be recognized for their capacity to handle change. Desired future statements such as “the library is regarded internationally as a model of excellence within a specific area” and “we are a dynamic organization that is flexible enough to respond to changing needs” (p. 23) is evidence of this.

It has been asserted the one of the most distinguishing features of a learning organization is its approach to change (McGill & Slocum, 1993). In the midst of quite complex change it is revealing that LIS staff took time to focus in their strategic planning process on how they might handle and respond to change into the future. That they wanted to become a “dynamic organization that is flexible enough to respond to changing times” (p. 23) is a powerful statement about the depth of cultural change which LIS staff were seeking to achieve through the LIS strategic planning process.

**The change process and the characteristics of the context of change**

The generic innovation and change framework takes account of the fact that innovation is often influenced by the characteristics of the context of change in which the change process takes place. In figure 2.3 this is shown by the characteristics of setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions which
underpins and may impact on and influence the nature and extent of any change process.

These same characteristics of the context of change as they relate specifically to the LIS case are shown in Table 5.1. In the LIS case there is evidence to support the conclusion that the introduction of the innovation of strategic planning and its use to drive change in the professional practice of LIS staff were influenced by these characteristics, and that they in turn influenced the nature and extent of the change.

For LIS staff, the setting of the wider library industry was influential on their particular scene, the LIS itself. For example, much of the preparation for the Decision Conference took account of wider industry developments in respect to matters such as the electronic library, trends in scholarly communication and new and emerging communication and information technology. The debate and topics from the Confronting the Future – university libraries in the next decade also appear to have been influential.

There is evidence, again in the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000, to show that LIS staff gave cognizance to the setting in their strategic planning process. For example, there is a focus (or Key Result Area) on Information Technology (defined in the LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000 as “using technology to access and deliver information, irrespective of location or format” and “using state-of-the art automated systems for efficient internal operations”).

LIS staff and others in various capacities were important actors in the strategic planning process and they impacted on the process. The events and activities of the LIS strategic planning process help to identify these actors and the frequency with which particular actors feature in the events and activities helps
to identify the range and complexity of actors involved in the LIS strategic planning process.

It is also reasonable to conclude that such actors influenced the rate at which the process progressed as well as the direction it took. For example, from the events and activities undertaken is it possible to identify some key players by either position title (for example, the University Librarian) or through the roles they played at various stages (for example, Decision Conference participants).

Sometimes, the actors exerted influence because of their formal position within the organization. For example, the University Librarian had authority through her position as leader. From her leadership position it was therefore easy for her to call staff meetings, set agenda and determine a resource allocation to support external activities (such as the AIMA Workshops, etc). At other times, actors may have exerted influence because of different factors, such as length of service (and associated corporate memory), level of respect among LIS staff and support or otherwise for the strategic planning process.

There were, however, other significant actors who had influence on the strategic planning process, who were outside of the immediate LIS staff. For example, the Decision Conference facilitators and those outside of the LIS staff who contributed to the MeetingWare session about the ideal library. Within some of the events and activities it can be determined that some actors external to LIS influenced the strategic planning process, both by virtue of their involvement in the process and because of their particular special expertise. For example, the decision by the University Librarian to use Decision Conferencing as a mechanism to help formulate the LIS strategic plan was influenced by the consultants from the Division of Business and Administration (p. 5).
During the course of the Decision Conference, and especially during the discussions devoted to determining a desired future state, LIS staff could have opted for several scenarios for their future development. The learning organization option was not the only one available. Indeed, during the course of the Decision Conference LIS staff collectively identified various “strategic alternatives” (p. 8). They used computer technology and the facilitators to help model these, including some benefit and costs analysis.

In terms of the innovation and change framework LIS staff had little or no choice to stay where they were at. The University Librarian and indeed the University’s executive management had reinforced the need for change. However, LIS did not have to determine a desired future state that set them on a path to becoming a learning organization. Alternatively, they could have determined to move less dramatically along the organizational continuum, say toward that of being a systems organization.

Issues of various kinds and complexities confronted the LIS staff throughout their strategic planning process. The issues and complexities outlined in Chapter 1, especially pressures for change on university libraries, had a significant impact. Within the various strategic thrusts (or key result areas) LIS staff faced many issues and complexities, and all of these impacted on the nature and extent of change. The complexity of some issues emerged early on in the Decision Conference. LIS staff developed a set of benefit and cost attributes to help them to better understand and resolve some of the issues that emerged and these attributes are summarized in Table 5.2

Actions needed to be taken by LIS in order to effect real change to their professional practice, especially to help translate the new philosophies of working with information, working with clients and working with others into tangible service options for LIS staff and, more importantly, for LIS clients. The
actions proposed by LIS staff were presented in Table 4.8. Actions were integral to the LIS strategic plan but they needed the actors (or the LIS staff) to effect specific projects before real change could begin. Often the resolution of issues helped to identify an appropriate course of action for the LIS staff.

Table 5.2: Benefit and cost attributes
(Source: *Decision Conference Report*, 1992, pp. 9-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible (adaptability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of client support (positive feedback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to library staff commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasibility (Achieving the strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation (excitement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy (ability to do what you want when you want)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort (to implement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand on training requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear that the actions initiated by LIS staff as part of the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000* and as a characteristic of the context of change, impacted on the nature and extent of the change process. In some cases the actions were considerable and involved lengthy project work. For example, while LIS staff
commenced work on acquiring an integrated computer system immediately after the Decision Conference, it was not until the beginning of 1995 that the system went live and was used by clients to access information as well as by LIS staff to better manage internal operations.

The change process and other factors influencing change

The literature reviewed in chapter 2 highlighted a complex array of factors likely to influence change. Table 2.1 also summarized Fullan’s eight basic lessons of the new paradigm of change. In the context of the LIS case there is evidence of varying degrees to highlight each of the eight lessons. In particular, the events and activities of the LIS strategic planning process especially support lesson four about vision and strategic planning and lesson seven about connection with the wider environment.

Given the experiences of the LIS case, and in light of the conclusions drawn about the criticality of the capacity of the LIS staff to develop and articulate a shared vision and to use this to drive the change process, there is scope to re-emphasize Fullan’s lessons about shared vision (vision and strategic planning come later) and the wider environment (connection with the wider environment is critical for success). There is also scope to add some additional lessons to Fullan’s list about the role of leaders in articulating a shared vision and about communication. In particular:

- **Lesson Nine:**
  Leaders are critical to the articulation of a shared vision. (What leaders say and do should reinforce new corporate cultures and new paradigms of professional practice.)
Lesson Ten:
Communication between all of the people involved in change is essential to ensure that the nature and extent of change is explained and to engage active support and enthusiasm for change. (You cannot assume that people will know and understand what is happening, that they will support change and will get involved with it.)

The LIS staff took several months (through May to August 1992) to reflect and settle on the words to describe their desired future state or shared vision for the future of the LIS. When they did formulate and confirm their vision statement during the course of the Decision Conference in August 1992, that statement became the guiding philosophy for the LIS. The words of the vision statement became symbolic of the nature and extent of the change process underway within the LIS. Actions by the LIS staff, such as using the vision statement in official documents, promulgating it in brochures and on notice broads and using the language of the vision statement in the course of their professional practice marked efforts to incorporate the vision into the organizational culture of LIS.

The official wording of the LIS vision as promulgated formally after the Decision Conference was:

“CUTLIS is a client-focused, dynamic university library and information service that provides clients and client groups with ready and timely access to information, including efficient document delivery. We value the quality of service to our client groups.

CUTLIS will be a source of pride to its staff, to Curtin University of Technology, and to the library and information profession. In harmony with the University’s development objective of excellence, responsiveness and internationalism, CUTLIS aims to function with state-of-the-art systems and technology as an integral part of the University’s teaching, research and learning programs.

CUTLIS strives to provide a stimulating work environment and professional development for staff.”
The process of forming a LIS shared vision involved interactions between various LIS staff, including peer to peer interactions (through the MeetingWare Sessions) and LIS staff with their leader (through the Decision Conference). Such “dynamic interaction between organizational members and leaders” is essential to the evolution of a shared vision (Fullan, 1993) (p. 28).

There were several steps along the way to creating the LIS shared vision. Firstly, the new University Librarian publicly advocated her vision, primarily through her inaugural address to staff, but also through less obvious channels, such as the selection process for the position of University Librarian. Secondly, the University Librarian involved others through the Decision Conference in the final shaping of the vision statement.

In the LIS case the vision and the associated strategic planning came much later than the formal announcement that change was underway within LIS, in fact, several months later. As discussed in chapter 2, in theoretical terms, therefore, the “ready, fire, aim” sequence of events took place (Fullan, 1993). That is, LIS staff and in particular the new University Librarian had set some broad direction – the “ready” sequence. This is evidenced through events and activities such as the University Librarian’s inaugural address to LIS staff. LIS staff then undertook some action and inquiry – the “fire” sequence. This is evidence by events and activities such as the AIMA Workshops and the MeetingWare sessions. Finally, LIS staff took “aim” in that they crystallized new beliefs, formulated a vision statement and focused on strategic planning through the Decision Conference.

The adoption phase of the LIS strategic planning process is dominated by many and varied examples of communication. There are many examples of organization-wide communications. Many of these were initiated by the University Librarian and were designed to inform LIS staff about events and
activities related to strategic planning. Often these communications used a variety of mediums to convey the message. Among the surviving LIS corporate records there are examples of written letters (LIS Corporate Record, 1992j), formal presentations to general staff meetings (LIS Corporate Record, 1992a) and records of meetings (LIS Corporate Record, 1992e) where obviously lengthy discussions took place.

There is evidence within the LIS corporate records to support the conclusion that there were also many occasions for verbal discussions. For example, one-on-one and small group communication about the nature and extent of the change process took place through mechanisms such as the University Librarian’s schedule of visits to sections and work groups.

During 1992 the events and activities of the adoption phase of the LIS strategic planning process took place largely before the context of the Internet and electronic communication as we have come to know electronic communication (especially email) to be in the late 1990s. Nevertheless, LIS staff were very cognizant of the potential of this form of communication and it was noted in their desired future state the importance of information technology (p. 13). Information technology in the future was to be used not only to deliver information, regardless of location or format, it was also to be used to run internal operations.

While communication in its broadest sense played a key role within the LIS strategic planning process (keeping people informed, discussing options etc), communication was also seen as important into the future of the strategic planning process. For example, the topic of communication was one of the five selected by the University Librarian for input from staff through the MeetingWare sessions. Therefore, there was direct LIS staff input and awareness of this, and this in turn was directly fed into the strategic planning.
process. During the course of the MeetingWare sessions on communication much commonality among the staff views emerged. For example, there were suggestions about how communication could be improved in the future desired state. In particular, the following comments summarize the sentiments expressed by LIS staff: “meetings of all library staff on a regular basis” (p. 29), “establish forums for discussion” (p. 29), “provision of clear, up-to-date written procedures” (p. 29), “Use diversity of media for communications (eg TV, Radio, print, computers)” (p. 29) and “have internal newsletter” (p. 29).

Towards the end of 1992, the establishment by the University Librarian of an internal working party to bring forward ideas and plans to improve internal communication was also significant.

As concluded by others, innovation is about the communication of change in ideas, practices and products (Spence, 1994). In the LIS case, communication in its broadest sense was important to the adoption phase of the innovation of strategic planning as well as to the change triggered by the process. Communication between and among the LIS staff (the actors) involved in strategic planning was essential to ensure that those affected by the change were informed about the nature and extent of change, actively engaged in the process and were enthusiastic about it. In this respect the purpose of communication often extended beyond merely informing others about developments. Communication was actively and frequently used in various forms to ensure interaction between the participants in the process and to engage them as active and positive supporters of change.

In the adoption phase of the LIS strategic planning process there are many examples of interaction with the wider environment - including the environment outside of the LIS, but still within the University, and the wider environment of the university libraries in Australia and the library and information sector worldwide. For example, LIS staff interacted with other
professional colleagues when they attended forums such as *Confronting the future: university libraries in the next decade*. Such instances of interaction with the wider environment provided opportunities to learn externally.

Perhaps the most obvious example of LIS staff engagement with the wider environment is symbolized through the strategic alliance thrust (or key result area) within the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000*. Through this focus it was the stated objective of the LIS staff to “build internal and external relationships with individuals, groups and institutions”. The computer modelling undertaken during the Decision Conference highlighted that the strategic alliance thrust offered less in terms of benefits and costs, rating it sixth out of the six options. Nevertheless, LIS staff did not totally reject this thrust, instead opting to give all of the identified strategic thrusts (previously summarized in Table 4.6) a place within the *LIS Strategic Plan 1992-2000*.

As the April 1993 industry forum on *Changes in scholarly communication patterns: Australia and the electronic library* was to prove to LIS staff, there were opportunities to tie internal strategic initiatives to larger sector-wide initiatives. For example, the announcement at that forum of $5 million in Commonwealth Government funding for infrastructure development ensured that LIS staff were in part able to realize some of their vision of new ways of working with information (Free, 1993). By participating in sector-wide projects LIS staff gained access to additional resources and were able to provide new electronic services in part fulfilment of their vision.

In relation to the innovation and change framework which emerged from the literature reviewed in chapter 2 and in light of its application to the specifics of the LIS case, as presented in Table 5.1, the study found that:
- The LIS strategic planning process as an innovation was adoption-dominated.
- The LIS strategic planning process was used to drive change towards the LIS becoming a learning organization. This is evidenced through the planned change to LIS staff professional practice as it related to philosophy, management practices, employees, customers and capacity to handle change.
- The particular characteristics of the LIS strategic planning process, in terms of the setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions influenced the nature of the change in the LIS professional practice.
- The capacity of LIS staff to develop and articulate a shared vision of LIS as a learning organization was a critical influence on the change process.
- Attention to all aspects of internal communication not only helped grow commitment to the shared vision but it was also a factor, which influenced the involvement and engagement of the LIS staff in the change process.
- Knowing what was happening in the wider environment (the world outside of the LIS organization) helped to shape the shared vision and influenced the change process.

Stemming from the findings of the study, there is scope to make recommendations about future professional practice and further research and these are presented in the following concluding chapter.
CHAPTER 6
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROFESSIONAL PRACTICE AND FURTHER RESEARCH

This concluding chapter presents recommendations for professional practice and further research.

The recommendations are underpinned by the assumption that the experiences of the LIS case may be transferable to other educational settings in similar circumstances and/or to university libraries seeking to use strategic planning as a process to drive change in professional practice.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO PRACTITIONERS

Recommendations to practitioners about professional practice are made regarding records management within LIS and about strategic planning and innovation and change in university libraries generally.

LIS and records management
The difficulties associated with locating data for the study highlighted significant shortcomings in the record management practices of the LIS. This is cause for concern for several reasons beyond simply the purposes of this study. Reasons of efficiency and accountability within public sector organizations in the 1990s demand a more considered, systematic and professional approach.

It is therefore recommended that LIS staff give urgent and immediate attention to developing a LIS-wide records management policy, which lays out standards and procedures for the creation, retention, distribution, storage, retrieval and disposition of the LIS corporate records. State Government guidelines exist to inform and facilitate this process (State Archives of Western Australia, 1992).
The Library Board of Western Australia Act, 1952-1983 gives legislative authority to the requirement for any government department, office, bureau or part thereof, and any statutory authority or local government body which maintains its own record keeping system to comply.

An efficient and effective records management system contributes to an organization’s objectives by managing the creation, retention, distribution, storage, retrieval and disposition of all types of records.

University libraries and strategic planning
Based on the conclusions drawn from the LIS case in relation to the research questions and the findings in respect to the innovation and change framework, a recommendation is made to practitioners about the professional practice value of using strategic planning as a dynamic and engaging process to help manage through complex times.

Based on the LIS case, a strategic planning process used, not only to define the nature and extent of change but to help drive significant change in professional practice, offers a valuable and dynamic process to help manage during difficult, complex and changeable times.

Accordingly, it is recommended that practitioners, especially University Librarians, view strategic planning as a dynamic and engaging process covering several dimensions. In this context strategic planning is used both to define a future desired state, as well as to drive significant change in professional practice, in terms of philosophy, management practices, employees, customers and capacity to handle change.
Such an approach takes library staff focus away from the technical aspects of the process and helps focus energy on creating the future desired state and helps engender enthusiasm and engagement with change.

This approach offers the potential to bring a new vitality and purpose to strategic planning within university libraries, helping to bring university libraries closer towards becoming true learning organizations. It moves the focus of library staff away from the somewhat technical, top-down and systems-driven model of strategic planning promulgated by Riggs in the early 1980s and which has been used in a number of libraries worldwide since then. It also helps to ensure that strategic planning is more than an exercise to produce a handsome volume to gather dust on the shelves in the University Librarian’s office. Instead, this approach recognizes that strategic planning is a process through which it is possible to develop a shared vision for the future of professional practice in academic librarianship and further, that the process can be used to achieve real cultural change within libraries. A strategic planning process offers an alternative way for University Librarians to engage all levels of library staff in the process of transforming and energizing university libraries towards a new paradigm of professional practice.

University libraries and innovation and change

The LIS case provides some lessons about innovation and change in professional practice which may be applicable to other university libraries seeking to use a strategic planning process as a driver of change in professional practice and to help introduce new paradigms of professional practice. Indeed, these lessons about innovation and change may be applicable in university libraries generally, and to the introduction of any significant new idea or new way of doing things or to any significant change process which might flow from the introduction of an idea, policy or practice that is perceived to be new and which triggers change.
In particular, the LIS case offers lessons about the key organizational factors shaping the response to innovation; the characteristics of the context of change; the key organizational processes helping to ensure successful adoption; the articulation of a shared vision and, finally, processes which help to ensure a shared vision.

Accordingly, it is recommended that University Librarians in their role as leader, have a good understanding of the dynamics and culture of their university library, so that they can be cognizant of the factors likely to shape the library staff response to new ways of doing things. University Librarians also need an appreciation of the characteristics of the context of change and to think about and plan carefully, processes that will ensure the successful adoption of new ways of doing things. They need to lead the process to formulate and articulate a shared vision for the university library and they need to ensure that appropriate processes are in place that will guarantee the vision is a shared one.

The LIS case reinforces to varying degrees Fullan’s eight basic lessons of the new paradigm of change previously presented in Table 2.1 and University Librarians and library staff generally would do well to understand and practice these eight lessons, when contemplating any type of change process. These lessons have been previously shared as part of professional practice focusing on theory into practice, in a keynote presentation at an international conference on libraries in technological universities worldwide (Williamson, 1999 in press).

Accordingly, it is recommended that practitioners, especially University Librarians, become familiar with Fullan’s eight lessons of the new paradigm of change and that these lessons become incorporated into best practice principles for professional practice in university libraries.
Furthermore, the LIS case highlighted two additional lessons which practitioners, especially University Librarians, would do well to become familiar with and apply in the course of their professional practice. These were that leaders are critical to the articulation of a shared vision, and, that communication between all of the people involved in change is essential to ensure that the nature and extent of change is explained and to engage active support and enthusiasm for change.

Accordingly, it is recommended that practitioners, especially University Librarians, become acquainted with these two LIS case lessons and that these lessons about the role of leaders in articulating a shared vision and using communication to inform, involve and engage library staff in new paradigms of professional practice become incorporated into best practice principles for professional practice in university libraries.

Summary of recommendations to practitioners
Recommendations have been made to practitioners about records management within LIS and about strategic planning and innovation and change in university libraries.

In summary, recommendations to practitioners for professional practice are that:
- LIS staff give urgent and immediate attention to developing an LIS-wide records management policy, which lays out standards and procedures for the creation, retention, distribution, storage, retrieval and disposition of the LIS corporate records.

- Practitioners, especially University Librarians, view strategic planning as a dynamic and engaging process covering several dimensions, with the focus that strategic planning is used both to define a future desired state, as well as to drive significant change in professional practice, in terms of philosophy,
management practices, employees, customers and capacity to handle change.

- University Librarians in their role as leader, have a good understanding of the dynamics and culture of their university library, so that they can be cognizant of the factors likely to shape the library staff response to new ways of doing things. University Librarians also need an appreciation of the characteristics of the context of change and to think about and plan carefully, processes that will ensure the successful adoption of new ways of doing things. They need to lead the process to formulate and articulate a shared vision for the university library and they need to ensure that appropriate processes are in place that will guarantee the vision is a shared one.

- Practitioners, especially University Librarians, become familiar with Fullan’s eight lessons of the new paradigm of change and that these lessons become incorporated into best practice principles for professional practice in university libraries.

- Practitioners, especially University Librarians, become acquainted with these two LIS case lessons and that these lessons about the role of leaders in articulating a shared vision and using communication to inform, involve and engage library staff in new paradigms of professional practice become incorporated into best practice principles for professional practice in university libraries.
RECOMMENDATIONS TO LIBRARY EDUCATORS

Recommendations to library educators are made regarding library curriculum and training to support the continuing professional development (CPD) needs of university library staff, especially those already in leadership positions.

Library school curriculum
The conclusions drawn from the LIS case in relation to the research questions and the findings in respect to the innovation and change framework highlighted the overall importance of the capacity of LIS staff to develop and give commitment to a shared vision for the future of LIS as a learning organization. It was the role of the LIS staff themselves and their University Librarian as leader, which was the key organizational factor shaping the response to the innovation of strategic planning. The LIS case also demonstrated how important it was to articulate the shared vision and, in particular, the role played in vision articulation by the University Librarian in her capacity as leader.

Ensuring the staff who work in libraries are knowledgeable about some of the underlying theories about leadership, strategic planning and change management may help to ensure that in the future change in the volatile environment of university libraries is better managed. There are a number of sound theoretical considerations and theories about leadership, strategic planning and change management which could effectively be incorporated into the curriculum of library schools. If this was done it would help to ensure that the library staff who assume leadership positions within university libraries (or libraries generally) or those that aspire to such positions, will be better informed about the theoretical dimensions of leadership, strategic planning and change management. They will have some theoretical basis and generic skills on which to construct their professional practice.
Accordingly, it is recommended that library educators give consideration to including aspects of leadership studies, strategic planning and change management in the curriculum for courses designed to provide an initial professional qualification.

**Continuing professional development (CPD)**
Given that many who assume leadership positions, either as University Librarians, Deputies or Associates, in university libraries often do so some years after their initial education and qualification as librarians, the question of continuing professional development (CPD) for University Librarians and senior library staff is an important one. Currently, there are some CPD activities available through the library industry’s professional association, the Australian Library and Information Association (ALIA). Also, some private training providers, such as AIMA offer a limited number of programs. However, this is an area where library schools within universities could play a greater role.

The involvement of library schools in catering for the CPD needs of University Librarians and senior library staff would afford new opportunities for synergies and sharing between educators and senior practitioners. It would help to ensure that educators are more aware of the challenges and opportunities confronting University Librarians and their senior library staff. Equally, University Librarians and their senior library staff would have opportunities to be better acquainted with new and emerging research trends and findings. This in turn, may offer new opportunities to University Librarians and their senior library staff to translate theory into professional practice and see the emergence of new paradigms of professional practice.

Accordingly, it is recommended the library educators give consideration to how they might better support the CPD needs of University Librarians and senior
library staff. Given that the library schools that mostly cater for the professional education needs of librarians are located in Australian universities, this would be a way to effect greater synergy between library practitioners and library educators.

Summary of recommendations to educators
Recommendations have been made to library educators about library curriculum and about opportunities to improve CPD for University Librarians and senior library staff.

In summary, recommendations to library educators are that they give consideration to:

- Including aspects of leadership studies, strategic planning and change management into the curriculum for courses designed to provide an initial professional qualification.

- How they might better support the CPD needs of University Librarians and senior library staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

The conclusions drawn from the LIS case in relation to the research questions and the findings in respect to the innovation and change framework indicates there is potential for further research in a number of areas.

In particular, there is scope for educational research to further test the robustness and viability of the generic innovation and change framework. Such research could be concerned with the dimensions of the innovation and change framework. For example, research could focus on particular topics within the following dimensions:
Change as an adoption-dominated process.

Change in relation to organizational factors such as the organization’s philosophy, management practices, employees, customers and capacity to handle change.

Change in relation to the characteristics of the context of change such as the setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions.

Change in relation to other influencing factors, such as shared visions, communication and the wider environment.

Change as an adoption-dominated process

Based on the findings and conclusions from the LIS case there is scope for further investigation and research about particular processes used by educational organizations during the adoption phase of an innovation.

Such investigations could build on the findings from this study and take up the call by Fullan to tease out what we know about the initiation process within the adoption phase of innovation. Fullan asked:

“what happens by way of mobilization, and planning to prepare for change. In particular, what do we know about successful initiation; that is, what do we know about startups that have a better chance of mobilizing people and resources towards the implementation of desired change?” (Fullan, 1991 p. 62-63).

Based on the LIS case the answer to this question would be linked to the following factors:

- The specific events and activities undertaken during adoption phase.
- The period of time between the announcement of the innovation of strategic planning, the formal commencement of the strategic planning process and the implementation of specific actions within the plan.
- A development of a shared vision of the direction of the desired change in terms of LIS philosophy, management practices, staff, clients and capacity to handle change.
- An appreciation of the characteristics of the context of change in terms of setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions.
- An awareness of other factors likely to influence, in particular, shared vision, communication and the wider environment.

Change in relation to organizational factors
Based on the findings and conclusions from the LIS case there is scope for further investigation and research about particular organizational factors likely to influence change as a result of some innovation.

Such investigations could build on the findings from this study and look more closely at the impact of change on the organization’s philosophy, management practice, employees, customers and capacity to handle change.

As the concept of the learning organization becomes more widely understood and many more organizations into the 21st century are looking to transform themselves into true learning organizations, there is scope for more investigation of the various components of a learning organization. For example, do the organizations which make the transformation provide better results or improved products and services for their customers and employees? What processes have these organizations put into place to improve their capacity to handle change? How is technology impacting on learning organizations – for example, how has technology improved organizational capacity to gather and use information?
Change in relation to the characteristics of the context of change

Based on the conclusions from the LIS case and the findings from the theoretical framework there is scope for further investigation and research about how the particular characteristics of the context of change influence the adoption of an innovation and the nature and extent of change.

Such investigations could be compared and/or contrasted to the findings from the LIS case and look more closely at the influence of setting/scene, actors, scenarios, issues and actions on the nature and extent of change triggered by the introduction of a significant innovation.

In particular, there are potentially interesting questions about what role leaders play in a change process. The LIS case highlighted significant roles played by the leader in relation to the articulation of a shared vision and processes to help ensure a shared vision. It would be desirable to examine and analyze other cases about innovation and change to see if other actors influence the articulation of a shared vision and how they influence the processes to help ensure a shared vision.

The LIS case also raised questions about the influence of a range of other actors involved in change, such as external consultants. There is potential to examine further the role of people and how they interact in a change process. In particular, how do factors like formal positions within an organization, years of service and the role played in the change process impact on the nature and extent of change.

Change in relation to other factors influencing change

Based on the conclusions from the LIS case and the findings in relation to the theoretical framework there is scope for further investigation and research about other factors likely to impact on the extent and nature of change.
In particular, studies could investigate issues related to factors such as shared visions, communication and the wider environment. Alternatively, there may be other factors which influence particular change processes which did not emerge in the LIS case. The interrelationships between the factors is also an area worthy of further investigation.

Additional case studies would help to highlight similarities and/or differences with the LIS case. They could also help to identify new components of the theoretical framework.

In particular, communication is a vast and complex area and is pervasive of any change process. The study of communication also crosses a number of discipline boundaries and offers opportunities for interdisciplinary research and for collaboration between researchers from different backgrounds. The area of electronic communication and its impact on change is a potentially new and exciting area for educational research.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This study has told the story of how the LIS staff used the innovation of strategic planning to develop a shared vision for the future of their professional practice and how LIS staff used the strategic planning process to drive through change to their professional practice.

The experience of the LIS staff was reported, examined and analyzed against the research questions and using the innovation and change framework, which emerged from the literature on educational innovation and change and organizational theory.
As a robust and rich study it serves to highlight the complexities of change. It also shows that the future is not as simple as choosing between alternative organizational scenarios offered by the present. Instead, the future begins as a vision and is a place that is created – created firstly in the mind and will, and then through actions. Bringing the vision to reality involves a journey and the events and activities of that journey change forever the characteristics of the context of change, especially the people involved.
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APPENDIX 1

Library
Curtin’s Gateway to Scholarly Information
& Information Service

Memo

To: Associate Professor Owen Watts, Acting DVC (T & E)
From: Vicki Williamson
Re: Ed D Thesis
Date: 2nd October 1998

Dear Owen

My Ed D thesis will be a case study of educational innovation and organisational change in the professional practice of the Curtin LIS staff over the period 1992 to 1997. In particular, the thesis will look in detail at the LIS Strategic Planning Process in terms of it being both an educational innovation and a driver or enabler for strategic change.

Data for the case study will come mainly from official Curtin LIS records. For example, notes from planning meetings, internal discussion documents, minutes of internal meetings and project reports. The methodology will involve a retrospective analysis of these documentary sources and the establishment of a case to help answer key research questions.

I am seeking your approval for me to access and use these documentary sources for the purposes of my research.

I will provide the University with the usual guarantees of confidentiality and assurances that the data will be aggregated and reported at the organisational unit level and will not in any way make reference to individuals. Nevertheless, if you felt it appropriate to restrict access to the thesis after its completion and lodgment with the University Library, I would be agreeable to such a restriction.

The case study experiences of the Curtin LIS are significant and will make an important contribution to the literature on educational innovation and change. As a working, real-life case study, the research will have a very practical and applied focus and hopefully be of benefit to others working in educational organisations.

My Doctor of Education enrolment is with the University's Faculty of Education and the Acting Dean, Dr Graham Dellar is my supervisor.

Office of the University Librarian
Vicki Williamson
University Librarian

Email: AVKW@cc.curtin.edu.au
Telephone: (08) 9266-7205
Fax: (08) 9266-3213
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I look forward to receiving your written approval of my request. Please let me know if you need more information.

Yours sincerely

Vicki Williamson
University Librarian
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Keywords selected to the file structure of the research archive.

1st level descriptors
Agreements
Audit
Committees
Compliance
Consultancy Services
Contracting-out
Corruption
Customer Service
Evaluation
Grant Funding
Implementation
Legislation
Meetings
Performance Management
Planning
Policy
Procedures
Reporting
Reviewing
Risk Management
Standards

2nd Level descriptors
Access and equity
Agenda
Annual Report
Archives
Attendance
Briefing Papers
Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO)
Ethnic Affairs
Library Materials
Minutes
Protocol
Records
Schedules
Unions
Volunteers
Worker Participation
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