

David F. Kohl

## Transforming the Academic Library Organization for Service in a Budget Constrained, Digital World

At a Point in Time



*This article describes in some detail an academic library organization in a continual process of adaptation to a changing external environment. Confronting and dealing with two significant environmental realities – constrained funding and the digital information revolution – the library has realized that to remain true to its core mission of identifying, preserving and making available the key documents of the human enterprise it must change its structure and procedures. Paradoxically, it must change to remain the same.*

Anpassung der Organisation einer Universitätsbibliothek in einer von knappen Budgets bestimmten digitalen Welt. Eine Momentaufnahme.

*Dieser Artikel beschreibt anhand ausgewählter Aspekte die Organisation einer Universitätsbibliothek in einem fortlaufenden Prozess der Anpassung an ein sich veränderndes Umfeld. Zwei wichtige Einflüsse, mit denen die Bibliothek konfrontiert ist und auf die sie reagieren muss – eingeschränkte Mittel und rasante Entwicklung der digitalen Information –, haben die Bibliothek erkennen lassen, dass sie, um ihrer zentralen Aufgabe (Sammeln, Aufbewahren und Erschließen von wichtigen Dokumenten) gerecht werden können, ihre Struktur und Arbeitsweise ändern muss. Paradoxerweise muss sie sich verändern, um unverändert zu bleiben.*

Transformation d'une bibliothèque universitaire dans une situation définie de budgets contraints et de la digitalisation. A un moment donné.

*L'article décrit en quelques détails l'organisation d'une bibliothèque universitaire en procès continue d'adaptation à un environnement changeant. Deux faits significatifs – le financement contraint et la révolution dans le secteur de l'information digitalisée – ont contribué à ce que la bibliothèque réalisait qu'elle doit changer sa structure et sa méthode de travail pour rester fidèle à son devoir central: la collection, la conservation et le catalogage des documents importants pour l'humanité. Paradoxalement elle doit se modifier pour rester constante.*

One of the most profound lessons of the theory of evolution is recognition of the dynamic nature of life. The central message evolution teaches is not that organisms have adopted to their environment in all sorts of wonderful and interesting ways, but that such adaptation is a constant and necessarily ongoing process. Thriving in one's environment is a never ending process of adjustment. In this sense, human organizations are no different. They not only need to appropriately fit into their environmental context, but, more importantly, they need to have the capacity to continue to fit into that environment. In other words, they need the ability to not only function well in their particular environment, but to be able to adjust and change as that environment changes.

A truly accurate description of the University of Cincinnati Libraries, therefore, needs to show not only its present structure but even more importantly to suggest how that structure continues to adapt to its changing academic environment. The task is to describe an organization at a point in time, but one which as well is in an active and deliberate attempt to anticipate its future.

## 1 Overview – Context and Issues

The University Libraries of the University of Cincinnati (UC) represents one of five jurisdictional libraries at the university. The other jurisdictions with their separate library systems reporting to their own Deans are: Medicine, Law, Raymond Walters Community College and Clermont Community College. Medicine and Law are separately administered due to standard US accreditation practices which very strongly encourage these units to report directly to the units they service. The two community colleges are separate due to a combination of historical and funding reasons. Although part of the University of Cincinnati, the two community colleges receive independent appropriations from the legislature. Historically they developed independently of the university and were only attached to the university as an administrative convenience.

Figure 1: University of Cincinnati Library Jurisdictions

University Libraries	
Librarians	29
Other Professional Staff	30
Support Staff	62
Total	121
Medical Libraries	
Librarians	7
Other Professional Staff	15
Support Staff	26
Total	48
Law Library	
Librarians	5
Other Professional Staff	3
Support Staff	7
Total	15
Raymond Walters Community College Library	
Librarians	7
Media Support Staff	5
Support Staff	3
Total	15
Clermont Community College Library	
Librarians	1
Support Staff	1.5
Total	2.5

As Figure 1 shows, University Libraries is the largest of the 5 jurisdictions and the only one with a Dean of Libraries. As the largest library entity it has responsibility for maintaining the universities' OhioLINK software and hardware and coordinating all OhioLINK activities for the University of Cincinnati. Advice and recommendations on OhioLINK issues, including coordinated collection development, are received through a hierarchical set of committees cumulating in a five member policy committee consisting of the directors of each of the jurisdictional libraries and chaired by the Dean of University Libraries. There are additional areas of coordinated library activity as well. UC librarians have faculty status and all tenure, promotion and sabbatical leave requests from library faculty are reviewed by a single cross jurisdictional library faculty committee. Promotion and tenure requests, however, originate in the jurisdictions and, once the central library faculty committee has made a recommendation, the request is returned to the appropriate jurisdictional library for approval and forwarding to the central university administration. Librarians are also members of the UC faculty union, they are represented by the AAUP (American Association of University Professors), and have a cross jurisdictional coordinating committee for dealing with all union matters. There are numerous other areas of cross jurisdictional coordination sometimes involving all five members but often subgroups as well for such matters as lobbying for collections budgets, efficient provision of training and bibliographical instruction services, and the like.

As has been the case for most libraries, for at least for the last decade, the two fundamental drivers of library change at Cincinnati have been budget pressures and coping with the overwhelming revolution in digital information. The budget pressures are a result of reduced state funding to the university and have required responses in all three major areas of library expenditures – collections, staffing and operations. The digital revolution has required the ongoing development of new services for our patrons, new internal procedures for almost all library operations and the development of major new units accompanied by the restructuring of many old units.

In addition, a key dynamic factor has emerged which is important enough to merit special attention. This is the strong movement towards greater central coordination. Historically, both the five library jurisdictions and the branch libraries of University Libraries have operated with considerable autonomy. Four developments have encouraged a movement towards increased centralization, however. The first is the centralizing effects of automation and the clear efficiencies that come from using common software, standardized hardware, university-wide databases (for patrons, privileges, financial accounting) and agreed upon automation procedures. The second arises out of our need (financial constraints) and ability (the easy sharing of electronic data) to undertake coordinated collection development. The third is unionization which requires cross jurisdictional involvement and activity for both library faculty and staff – most of whom are unionized employees. And the fourth is shared off site storage which requires coordinated policies, funding and administration among jurisdictions and branches. In conjunction with financial constraints and the challenges of digital information this increased

pressure towards centralization which represents a third formative influence affecting library evolution.

## 2 University Libraries – The Largest Jurisdiction

The administrative structure of University Libraries is best thought of in six key areas: Reference and Branch Libraries (Information Services Division), Technical Support (Access Services Division), Training and Educational Services, Innovative Services (Corporate Partnerships and the University of Cincinnati Digital Press), Acquisitions and Administrative Staff. The first five are primarily line operations with the sixth representing staff support. Of primary interest in this report will be the first four units with Acquisitions issues dealt with in the treatment of Reference and Branch Libraries.

### 2.1 Reference and Branch Libraries

This is the most traditional and in many ways, unchanged division, providing central reference and government documents service as well as full library public services through nine branch libraries (see Figure 2). These units are the primary „public face“ of University Libraries providing reference services, some bibliographic instruction (primarily at the upper specialist level), collection development (selection) expertise and, in the branches, daily operations oversight. Each of the branches is headed by a professional librarian while the central reference/government documents unit is overseen by a three person team of two reference librarians and the division head.

Figure 2: Reference and Branch Libraries

Chemistry/Biology Library  
Classics Library  
College Conservatory of Music Library  
Curriculum Resource Center (Education) Library  
Design, Architecture, Art and Planning Library  
Engineering Library  
Geology/Physics Library  
Mathematics Library  
Ohio College of Applied Science (OCAS) Library  
Reference and Government Documents

Over the past ten years two primary operational issues have influenced the direction and structure of this division. The first was the need to consolidate and improve the efficiency of staffing due to budget reductions (about 8 positions) and the second was the need to protect the collections budget which is serviced by reference bibliographers. While most of the staff consolidation was handled through attrition of „excess“ support positions (e.g. a reference secretary or low level support staff members), major changes/reductions were made as well in the administration of the central reference unit located in Langsam Library. After much discussion, it was felt that as a professional unit it was not necessary to have a head of Reference. That position was abolished and the work formerly done by the reference head was taken on by three reference librarians who accepted the additional assignments for a small increase in pay.

More importantly, however, was finding a way to make better use of our reference librarians. It has long been

known that half or more of the questions asked of reference librarians are directional or informational (e.g. what are the library hours, where are the restrooms) rather than real reference or search questions which require the skill and training of reference librarians<sup>1</sup>. Consequently, we reorganized the reference area to reflect a hierarchy of information needs. Upon entering the library the patron passes by a large bank of computers. Those patrons who know what they want or need are filtered out by this self-service installation. After the computers is an information desk staffed with graduate students who have been trained to answer directional and straight-forward informational questions. This filters out another large group of patrons. The small number of remaining patrons with serious reference or search questions are referred to the reference consultation center staffed by reference librarians. This „Maslow Hierarchy“ of sorting information needs allows us to efficiently match the level of resource provided to the level of the information need. Simply using our most expensive resource, reference librarians, for all levels of questions was no longer feasible.

The goal of central reference and the branch libraries, however, is not just to provide a courteous and competent service for patrons who come into the libraries, but to actively engage with the academic departments they serve. Selectors, for example, are expected to meet regularly with members of the academic departments for whom they purchase books and journals to seek their guidance and input on collection development matters. Branch and reference librarians all have library advisory committees from the departments they serve and they are expected as well to take the initiative in developing appropriate courses of bibliographic instruction, library web pages, electronic course reserves, development opportunities (raising money from private individuals, corporations and foundations), etc...

As university funding has become increasingly limited, and hence competitive, however, a melancholy, if increasingly obvious, reality has emerged. This strong engagement by our public service units with the rest of the university allows them as well to serve as crucial elements of a political strategy in securing and maintaining library funding. As a result, our need, indeed our success, in not just maintaining but substantially growing our collections budget depends heavily on bibliographer involvement with their departments. Particularly in the branch libraries this political need has affected library organization – expressing itself as a conservative organizational force.

The university administration has many demands on its resources and the strong grassroots faculty and student

1 Jeffrey St. Clair and Rao Aluri: Staffing the Reference Desk: Professionals or Nonprofessionals. In: *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 3 (1977) 3, p. 149-153; Robert Balay and Christine Andres: Use of the Reference Service in a Large Academic Library. In: *College and Research Libraries* 36 (1975) 1, p. 9-26; John P. Wilkinson and William Miller: The Step Approach to Reference Service. In: *RQ* (Summer 1978), p. 293-299; Victoria T. Kok and Anton R. Pierce: The Reference Desk Survey: A Management Tool in an Academic Research Library. In: *RQ* 22 (1982) 2, p. 181-187; Mary Jo Lynch: Reference Interviews in Public Libraries. In: *Library Quarterly* 48 (1978) 2, p. 119-142.

voice which bibliographer engagement engenders is most helpful at budget time. The most compelling example of how such political power can be brought to bear is the agreement which the libraries with strong faculty support reached eight years ago with the university administration. This was the agreement that the library's collection budget would be increased by at least 8 % (or about 1/2 million in new, permanent dollars) per year. Library lobbying alone could neither have initiated nor sustained such increases – strong student and faculty, primarily faculty, support was crucial.

Perhaps in happier economic times the idea that library organization and mission must reflect political agendas would not be necessary. It would certainly be nice, and somehow purer, to be able to focus on only the library service issues. At Cincinnati, however, that would be foolish in the extreme. There is simply too much competition for university resources.

The organizational implication of this reality, however, is a very conservative one, making some changes politically unacceptable even if organizationally appropriate. A number of librarians, teaching faculty and even upper level university administrators have argued that a single central library operation would be more desirable than the present central-branch library organization. They make several important and valid points. Such consolidation would provide cost savings through economies of scale, the growth of interdisciplinary academic agendas in research and teaching make subject oriented branch libraries a nuisance by scattering the needed resources throughout multiple libraries, and the use and importance of the small subject based libraries has declined with the growth of off site storage (UC currently has half a million volumes stored off site), and the development of quick, easy and reliable access to all state academic collections via OhioLINK patron-initiated circulation (presently 25 % of all UC circulation transactions are with other OhioLINK libraries). And finally, the growing importance of electronic resources, e-journals, e-books and databases, which are most efficiently delivered from a central source, seriously undercut the traditional need for branch libraries.

And yet, while all this is logical and true, the indelible lesson, regularly reinforced, is that faculty are much more supportive of library agendas when their core collections are in branch libraries than when the collections are in a large, central repository. In good times such support might not matter; in difficult times it is critical. And so, Cincinnati will continue to have branch libraries for the foreseeable future.

## 2.2 Technical Services

Our Access Services Division (see Figure 3 for constituent units) is focused primarily on providing support to other library operations although it does include two public services units – Central Circulation and Periodicals. It is a matter of deliberate policy that all of our divisions provide some direct public services. Such a policy serves as an important and inherent reminder that the library's main purpose is public service. When library divisions have no direct contact with patrons it is easy for them to lose the public service focus and instead begin to attend too much to internal routines and processes.

Figure 3: Access Services Units

Bibliographic Access Department  
 Cataloging and Database Management Department  
 Conservation and Binding Department  
 Information Delivery Services Department  
 Library Automation Department  
 Periodical Services Department  
 Circulation Services Department

In this area of the library, budget pressures combined with the needs of dealing with the new digital environment have required substantial and ongoing organizational change. The task has been to find procedural efficiencies and other cost savings to allow us to both downsize the workforce in the library generally as well as shift employees to newly established units such as patron initiated circulation and web cataloging.

One of the key sources for finding such efficiencies and cost savings has been through automation and outsourcing. Overall, this strategy has allowed us to reduce the numbers of staff substantially in 10 years – by about 20 %. The cost savings have not been completely commensurate, however, since the savings provided by replacing staff with automation have been partially offset by the higher wages of upgraded staff required to deal with automation. While the staff unions have not been particularly pleased to see the number of workers decrease, they have been mollified to a certain extent by the higher wages required by a more sophisticated and automated operation. A strong program of in-house training and promotion has been an important part of managing this upward organizational flow.

As might be expected, areas which formerly had large numbers of relatively low level staff (e.g. circulation, technical processing) have seen the greatest number of staff replaced by automation. The outsourcing, on the other hand, has taken place primarily in professional areas such as cataloging. Rather than outsource the work presently done by original catalogers, we have used the outsourcing to allow us to move more flexibly into new areas. For example, we have outsourced such new cataloging initiatives as modern Greek, Audiovisual, Chinese, and microform sets.

Freeing technical services staff from their traditional duties has been important because a number of new initiatives needed to be undertaken in a no-growth environment. Since no new staff were available, only reassignments were possible. While the advent of web cataloging is an obvious new need which we could not easily outsource, there were other, less obvious functions which also required new staff. For example, just over five years ago, the Libraries became full. That is, for every new volume which came in, another volume had to be sent to offsite storage. Over 50 000 volumes a year need to be sent to storage – requiring additional work to change records, physically process, and transport this many items year in and year out. Only by finding efficiencies in established areas could this new work be undertaken.

In the case of patron initiated circulation a whole new unit had to be created through reassignment. Within the OhioLINK consortium (79 academic libraries) patrons may request materials from other libraries as a circulation function rather than as an Interlibrary Loan transaction. For students and faculty this ability to easily, quickly

(48 hours) and reliably check out materials from a 24 million volume virtual collection is one of the most popular services offered by the Libraries. Presently about 25 % of Cincinnati's total circulation is with other Ohio-LINK libraries – around 3 000 items a week. While inter-institutional borrowing and lending on a circulation model is much, much cheaper than Interlibrary Loan (\$ 1.00 per completed transaction versus \$ 30.00 per completed transaction), the sheer volume of use for this very popular service required establishing a new unit devoted to these activities. But here too, reallocation was the only means available to us to find the staff to handle this work.

### 2.3 Training and Educational Services

Napoleon famously remarked that „The logical outcome of fighting a defensive battle is surrender.“ Finding ways to save money by use of new technologies and increasing procedural efficiency is both appropriate and useful, but these are defensive measures. The library's strategy must also include initiatives to bring more money into the system. Aggressively moving to increase the collection's budget has already been mentioned. The formation of the Training and Educational Services unit (TES) nine years ago, however, was an attempt to create an entrepreneurial unit which would not only forward an important library agenda – education and training in the use of information resources – but to actively explore cost recovery mechanisms in the process.

Given that the idea was new both within the library and within the university, it took several years to set up. Two of the unit's staff came from the central Reference department. These were two of the most adventurous and entrepreneurial of our reference librarians. The head of the unit and another professional position came from a general reallocation of library resources as did two support staff positions. And a fifth professional position was hired with the expectation that within three years grant income would fully cover this position's salary.

To-date, progress has been slow but steady. The unit has explored, for example, teaching for-credit required courses on information issues on a cost recovery basis in several of UC's colleges, providing a site for library school distance education courses using an income sharing approach with another university, and generating grant income. While experimentation continues, the most successful of the ventures has been providing faculty training on electronic tools and resources through university grant funding. This program of faculty training, undertaken by TES and the medical school library, has generated around \$ 200 000 per year in internal grant income for the library.

The increasing success of TES in securing non-traditional library funding has been the catalyst in expanding the entrepreneurial spirit to other parts of the library. Recently, the university has been concerned about the retention of first year students. Too many of our students drop out or transfer to other institutions after their first year at UC. Intrigued by TES's success, the Reference department is presently partnering with TES to develop a virtual undergraduate library funded by internal grant support.

As a large and complex university with a large and complex library, we realized that many of the new students in

their first two years were overwhelmed by the richness and complexity of the resources available to them. Coming from vastly simpler educational environments they tended to find the large array of information sources available to them confusing and overwhelming. The very richness of reference and collection resources which the librarians had worked so hard to create, was proving a hindrance rather than an asset to student adjustment to the university environment.

This is not a new problem at large state universities. Most other large state schools have dealt with this problem by creating special undergraduate libraries with a simpler array of information tools, a more personalized outreach, and a strong bibliographic instruction program. These „training“ environments serve to facilitate the new students' acclimatization to the rich and complex resources of a major research and teaching institution.

Since funds were not available within the traditional library budget to create such a separate, specialized library at the University of Cincinnati, we created a „virtual undergraduate library“ in a section of our main library. Remodeling and program costs were relatively small compared to the construction of a new building and were underwritten extensively by internal university grants. Even the cost of two full time professional staff was underwritten by internal grants. Consisting of roughly 1 000 square feet near the front entrance of the main library (Langsam), the space has been designed as a readily identifiable area. Its program is overseen by two full time librarians with assistance from both central reference and TES professional staff. Although only in its first full year of operation, the virtual undergraduate library has been very well received by students, administration and librarians. It has solved a major outreach issue for the university while providing a successful rationale for increased library funding.

Altogether TES related initiatives are bringing in around 1/3 million dollars in non-traditional income to the library per year. Purists could argue that the university should routinely be supporting such initiatives and they would probably be right. But in an era when even internal funding is increasingly competitive and problematic, finding new successful models for generating library support from internal sources are most useful.

### 2.4 Innovative Services

While finding mechanisms for becoming more competitive for internal resources is important, it has its limitations – especially when University resources are, in total, declining due to reduced state support. Getting better at going after a larger piece of a smaller and smaller pie is not a complete strategy. It was clearly necessary to find mechanisms which would allow the library to tap into money outside the University as well. The trick here was to solve two problems simultaneously. Because we needed money, the initiatives needed to be „profitable“ and because we were an academic library the initiatives needed to further or arise out of the research library agenda. Two very different initiatives have proven very successful.

### 2.1.1 Corporate Partnerships

Like many of the state governments in the U.S., Ohio is very concerned that its investment in public higher education be seen partially as an investment in corporate competitiveness. There is a certain logic here since the better the business community does, the more taxes they pay and the more money the state gathers. Sadly, the idea of higher education as an intrinsic good gets more discussion on university campuses than in the state legislature. In any case, one of the several purposes of higher education in Ohio, and in fairness, hardly a major purpose, is to promote business growth.

It is in this context that University Libraries established its program of corporate partnerships. Typically in the U.S. a business relationship between a university library and a commercial corporation is limited to document delivery. Invariably a university collection, particularly in journals, is much more extensive than any corporate collection and it is a cost effective approach for the business to use the more extensive library collection to supplement their core business collection as needed. The problem with this approach is that it generates little net income for the library provider.

In Cincinnati we took another approach. Our corporate program involves actually operating the corporate library for the business. We train and supply staff, we operate the onsite library operation, and we provide all necessary library services, including document delivery, training in the use of electronic information tools, organization and retrieval of internal documents and any other needed library services. In short, the corporation contracts out the library services to the university library.

Although complex to set up, for the library these are very lucrative contracts for the library, generating substantial net income to library operations. University Libraries presently has such contracts with two major Cincinnati corporations, General Electric (probably well known in Europe) and Equistar (a large U.S. petrochemical company). The gross revenue from these contracts is over 1/3 million dollars per year and the *net* annual income supports in part or fully half a dozen library (in addition to the corporate) positions. These library positions are devoted to campus, i.e. faculty and student, support which we would not otherwise be able to afford. What makes these contracts of interest to the corporations is that we have been able to provide better service for a much lower price than the corporations have been able to provide themselves.

### 2.2.2 University of Cincinnati Digital Press

The University of Cincinnati Digital Press (UCDP) arose out of our need to solve a collections problem. Shortly after I arrived, over ten years ago, the Head of Archives and Rare Books pointed out to me that three of our most valuable rare books dealing with the European exploration of North America badly needed restoration. Arrangements were made and a year and half later the three books were returned wonderfully restored. Shortly after our announcement that these important and irreplaceable materials would be once again be available to future generations, a history professor contacted the Head of Rare Books. He wanted his first year students to experience the excitement of research using original

materials and requested permission to have 40 Freshman students use the newly restored materials for papers he intended to assign.

A core library dilemma was thus revealed. Libraries collect materials so that they can be used by future generations, but that very use, even when careful and respectful, will ultimately destroy the materials. The traditional library solution has been to seriously restrict access to rare and irreplaceable materials in order to preserve the original documents as long as possible. While restricted research use would substantially lengthen the survival period of the materials (while the accelerated use of a teaching environment could destroy materials within a generation), this seemed like a harsh tradeoff – especially for a university where teaching was as important as research.

Our solution, a compromise between preservation and accessibility, was to separate the artifact from the content. Access to the artifact, the original document, would continue to be highly restricted and limited to serious scholarly use only. But the content, kept as true to the original as possible, would be made widely available. The first mechanism we considered for making this content widely available was the production of a printed replica. This proved to be prohibitively expensive. Our second thought was digitization. Upon examination this proved attractive for a number of reasons – four of which were primary.

Firstly, the logistics for digitization were advanced enough to allow for the production of a very good product and library digital infrastructure was sophisticated enough to provide an appropriate delivery mechanism. Secondly, a digital replica would allow us to provide significant added value for the researcher, e.g. in terms of electronically searching the text or images, linking the text and images by point and click, and providing bibliographic links to earlier research including web sites. Thirdly, we quickly realized that we could economically overcome the limits of our own collection by supplementing the core materials we held with variants or better copies of particular items from other collections, in essence creating a relatively complete, „ideal“ work/collection not available in any one library. Fourthly, the economics were favorable, particularly in terms of sustainability. Although the costs of creating the first digital volume was relatively costly, subsequent digital copies were incredibly cheap to produce. By selling these additional copies at cost (including pro rating the expenses of the first digital copy) to other libraries and museums, we could recover enough money to fund the second project, and so on. In short, we saw the Press as an economically viable way to preserve our collection and increase the availability of its content both on campus and worldwide.

Organizing the Press has been a long and complex process but it is now getting up to speed. Three works have been produced and a fourth will be finished this fall. They have met a good critical reception by the research and scholarly community and, although designed as niche products, are selling well. We believe the omens are favorable for continued, even accelerated, growth of the Press and its publications. At this point the Press is covering its out of pocket production costs and within the next three years we hope to be covering the salaries of most of its five staff as well. While becoming self support-

ting is a desirable and intended goal for the Press, serving as a means for preserving and making available rare and irreplaceable materials important to the academic community is the Press's fundamental mission. On this basis, it may always be appropriate for the Press to receive some library or University support (see Figure 4).

Figure 4: UCDP

**Mission:**

The University of Cincinnati Digital Press is devoted to the electronic publication of original documentation of the European exploration of the Transmississippi West for use in research and instruction. The objective of the Press is to publish collections of primary documentation incorporating high resolution images, databases, texts, and supporting documentation with an interface offering maximum opportunities for searching, examination, and analysis of the contents.

**Staff:**

Director, David F. Kohl  
 Editor-in-Chief, Alice Cornell  
 Assistant Editor, Marie Scheponick  
 Technical Research and Development Manager, Linda Newman  
 Business Manager and Assistant to the Director, Ron Frommeyer  
 Web Site: <[www.ucdp.uc.edu](http://www.ucdp.uc.edu)>

### 3 Conclusion

What we have attempted to illustrate is a library in transition. Identifying the basic forces of change – financial pressures, the new environment of digital information, and the need for more centralization and co-ordination,

we have attempted to show how a library organization can creatively and usefully respond – often, but not always, by organizational change.

And change, libraries must. But the calculus of this change must take into consideration both the new environment and its pressures as well as the institution's history. The evolving library and the structures it develops to help staff undertake time honored tasks in new circumstances are not discontinuous with the past, but emerge from and build on the past. In many ways, what is most interesting about change is what doesn't change. For it is those unchanging features which represent the core of what a library is: the identification and collection of the key documents of the human enterprise, the preservation of these materials, and making them available both intellectually and physically to new generations. How we go about those tasks must change as circumstance and technology changes. But the time honored tasks themselves, the librarian's mission, remains unaltered.

**Address of the author:**

David F. Kohl  
 University of Cincinnati Digital Press  
 University of Cincinnati  
 Cincinnati, OHIO 45 221-0033  
 P.O. Box 21 00 33  
 USA  
 David.Kohl@uc.edu