

2013

Library Faculty and Instructional Assessment: Creating a Culture of Assessment through the High Performance Programming Model of Organizational Transformation

Meredith G. Farkas

Portland State University, meredith.farkas@pcc.edu

Lisa J. Hinchliffe

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Follow this and additional works at: http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/ulib_fac

 Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Citation Details

Farkas, Meredith G., and Lisa J. Hinchliffe. "Library Faculty and Instructional Assessment: Creating a Culture of Assessment through the High Performance Programming Model of Organizational Transformation." *Collaborative Librarianship* 5.3 (2013).

This Article is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Library Faculty Publications and Presentations by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. For more information, please contact pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Library Faculty and Instructional Assessment: Creating a Culture of Assessment through the High Performance Programming Model of Organizational Transformation

Meredith G. Farkas (mfarkas@pdx.edu)
Portland State University

Lisa J. Hinchliffe (ljanicke@illinois.edu)
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Abstract

In an environment in which libraries increasingly need to demonstrate their value to faculty and administrators, providing evidence of the library's contribution to student learning through its instruction program is critical. However, building a culture of assessment can be a challenge, even if librarians recognize its importance. In order to lead change, coordinators of library instruction at institutions where librarians are also tenure-track faculty must build trust and collaboration, lead through influence, and garner support from administration for assessment initiatives. The purpose of this paper is to explore what it takes to build a culture of assessment in academic libraries where librarians are faculty through the High Performance Programming model of organizational change. The guidelines for building a culture of assessment will be exemplified by case studies at the authors' libraries where instruction coordinators are using collaboration to build a culture of assessment with their colleagues.

Introduction

Providing evidence of the library's contribution to student learning through its instruction program is critical in today's era of quality concerns and accountability. However, even if librarians recognize the importance of assessment, building a culture of ongoing assessment and continuous improvement can be a challenge. Doing so is especially challenging when librarians are also faculty, due to competing priorities and the autonomy that comes with faculty status. This paper explores what it takes to build a culture of assessment through the High Performance Programming model in academic libraries where librarians are faculty and discusses what librarians can do to lead change processes with library faculty. Case studies are provided of instruction programs in the libraries at the authors' institutions: Portland State University and the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Lakos and Phipps provide an often-cited definition of a culture of assessment: "A Culture of Assessment is an organizational environment in which decisions are based on facts, research, and

analysis, and where services are planned and delivered in ways that maximize positive outcomes and impacts for customers and stakeholders."¹ In an assessment culture, assessment becomes part of the fabric of what the library does, just like buying materials and checking them out, and its value is recognized across the institution. It is not something that the library does in order to please accreditors or university administrators, but to appropriately target its services and better serve its constituents. In spite of the fact that many libraries strive to be user-focused, many do not have a culture in which assessment is a regular part of their practice. In a recent survey of libraries at bachelor's-, master's-, and doctorate-granting institutions in the United States, only 59% reported having a culture of assessment.²

In a true culture of assessment, negative assessment findings are treated as an opportunity for improvement, not evidence that an employee has failed in a performance review. With respect to an instruction program in an academic library, a culture of assessment would mean an organizational environment in which people



trust their colleagues and administrators sufficiently to be willing to risk discovering negative things about their teaching. For tenure-track librarians, this might be perceived as particularly risky, as negative results could lead to a tenure denial. As such, developing a culture of assessment creates an environment for improving instructional services and student learning.

Though Lakos and Phipps describe a desired end-state, a culture of assessment, it is not necessarily easy to enact this if an ideal organizational culture does not exist. Changing culture requires effort and intentionality. Guiding principles and frameworks for analysis can assist in thinking through process and evaluating progress. The High Performance Programming model is one such framework for looking at organizational culture and processes for building trust, a compelling shared vision, and a user-focused culture, all of which are critical elements of building a culture of assessment.

The High Performance Organization

In 1984, Nelson and Burns published a book chapter that offered a compelling vision of the high performance organization and provided clear and concrete steps toward achieving it.³ Since its publication, many authors have defined the high performance organization, with all of them sharing certain characteristics.⁴

- The high performance organization has moved from leadership via control to leadership via commitment. Leaders build loyalty through their commitment to their employees and developing employees' sense of ownership in the organization. There is a strong emphasis on ritual and the development of a strong, almost clannish, culture.⁵
- Most high performance organizations have adopted a flat organizational structure and a participatory management model. Workers tend to be organized into teams, and teams have a great deal of autonomy, authority, and responsibility. Unlike many team-based organizations, silos do not exist in the high performance model and people from any area of the organization can make suggestions for areas outside of their direct responsibility.

- Quality of service is the highest priority, so ideas designed to improve service are taken seriously, regardless of who they come from.⁶
- Communications are honest and transparent; information is neither kept from employees nor from leaders. Leaders are open to feedback and criticism and invite it.

Two key characteristics that distinguish the high performance model from other types of organizational frames described by Nelson and Burns are a clear sense of purpose and a wide-reaching commitment to the organizational vision. Members of the organization not only have a strong commitment to the vision, but the vision is so clear that each of them, if asked to articulate it, would say virtually the same thing.⁷ Since commitment to the vision is so pervasive in the organization, leaders can feel comfortable giving employees the freedom to be creative in designing programs, products, and services in support of achieving that vision.⁸ This freedom makes employees feel comfortable taking risks and trying new things. In a learning culture, anything new, whether a success or failure, will lead to new learning that can improve service. Autonomy and commitment to vision engenders an energy that makes people excited to come to work.

The high performance organization sits in contrast to three other organizational frames defined by Nelson and Burns: reactive, responsive, and proactive.

- The reactive organization is characterized by chaotic activity and a lack of any shared sense of purpose. Employees in a reactive organization do not know by what standards they are being judged, which leads to a focus on self-preservation rather than the good of the organization.
- The responsive organization has a strong sense of purpose and is focused on short-term goals. Employees know what they need to do and managers are focused primarily on coaching employees to meet those well-defined goals.
- A proactive culture is focused more on the future and creating a shared vision for the

organization. In this frame, employees are empowered to develop long-term goals that are consistent with the organizational vision. Employees feel a sense of ownership of and commitment to the organization.

Each of these frames has a very different focus and requires a different leadership style and employee perspective.⁹ The characteristics of each organizational frame are illustrated in Table 1.

Nelson and Burns use the term “programming” in their book to describe what has to happen to move from one frame to another.¹⁰ An organiza-

tion cannot transform itself overnight, but the actions that leaders take now will help to program the organization of the future. After all, organizational culture is based upon shared history, and leaders must create the shared history of the future by programming changes today. This highlights the notion that truly transformative change requires a significant investment of time focused on organizational development. Beer suggests that organizations should not have ambitious performance goals during times of intensive organizational development because they will then feel obligated to focus on initiatives rather than on transforming culture.¹¹

	Reactive	Responsive	Proactive	High Performing
Organizational focus	Past events and responding to threats. There is an external locus of control.	Short-term goals and responding to near-term realities. There is an external locus of control.	Long-term goals and planning for the future. There is an internal locus of control.	Programming the future. There is an internal locus of control.
Organizational structure	Command and control.	Hierarchical.	Flat.	Flat and structured around formal and informal teams.
Management and leadership focus	Enforcing rules and fixing blame.	Coaching employees to meet their short-term goals and solving problems that prevent the organization from meeting its goals.	Creating a shared sense of purpose and motivating employees to further the mission of the organization.	Empowering employees and creating shared commitment.
Employee focus	Self-preservation.	Specific short-term goals.	The organization and its mission.	A shared vision and a strong sense of organizational culture.
Communication within the organization	Fragmented and unclear.	Focused on providing feedback to employees about their performance.	Focused on employees providing feedback to management.	Transparent with a bi-directional flow.

Table 1. Characteristics of frames as identified by Nelson and Burns.



While this framework has not been previously explored in the library literature, High Performance Programming appears to be compatible with libraries and a useful model for organizational development within libraries. The high performing organization is strikingly similar to the ideal organizational culture for building a culture of library assessment as described by Lakos and Phipps.¹²

Building a culture of assessment requires much more than a change in behavior; it requires internalizing the value of assessment. Inherent in this is a focus on service quality and openness to feedback that could improve quality. At some institutions, the primary impetus for doing assessment work is accreditation or administrative mandate. This does not necessarily mean that faculty are not conducting assessments in a meaningful way or that results are not used to improve services or teaching. However, in a culture of assessment, instructional assessment becomes an integral part of teaching and is used to improve future instruction and plan new initiatives. A culture of assessment is a culture of learning, where librarians are curious about student learning and want to understand how to improve their teaching. Ennis argues that “‘assessment culture’ is code for not just doing assessment, but liking it.”¹³ This suggests that building a culture of assessment requires employee commitment and belief in its value rather than simply a willingness to follow orders. While this could happen in a proactive culture, the high performance culture is marked by a strong sense of purpose and a deep commitment to service.

Nelson and Burns’ organizational framework can be used as a tool to diagnose what needs to change in an organization for it to become high performing. Most organizations do not fit strictly into one of the frames listed above, but exhibit characteristics from several of them. Knowing what characterizes the high performance frame and determining which elements of one’s own organizational culture do not fit can provide clear guidance about what needs to change. For the library leader seeking to develop a culture of assessment, the High Performance Programming framework is a powerful lens for examin-

ing current organizational culture and programming for organizational transformation.

The High Performance Organization and the Faculty-Driven Library

Just as there are many shared elements of the High Performance Programming framework and a culture of assessment, there are many parallels between library faculty status and the High Performance Programming framework, with shared governance and autonomy being key examples. Hinchliffe and Chrzastowski demonstrated how the autonomy that often comes with faculty status can empower librarians to innovate and experiment without waiting for administrative approval.¹⁴ The shared-governance model, which is in evidence at many libraries with faculty status, gives every faculty member a voice in the administration and future of their library.¹⁵ At the University of Arizona in the 1990s, a new library dean helped restructure the library around teams and shared leadership. In this model, administrators provide support and guidance, but each team has the authority to make its own decisions.¹⁶ Shared governance sits in stark contrast to hierarchical forms of library governance, which are focused on administrative control. In shared governance, all faculty members must create change through influence, rather than positional authority. Faculty models are also typically marked by relatively flat organizational structures similar to those described in the High Performance Programming framework.

There are other aspects of faculty culture that are less conducive to adopting the high performance model and building a culture of assessment. Some authors have highlighted the individualistic focus of faculty¹⁷ and argue that it stands in opposition to the collaborative nature of librarianship.¹⁸ It is true that there are some inherent conflicts between tenure expectations at some institutions and the work of librarianship, which includes teaching and assessment. The emphasis placed in some tenure and promotion systems on scholarship can, at times, force faculty to prioritize publishing over public service work. For example, in their 2006 survey of priorities in public services librarianship, Johnson

and Lindsay found a disconnect between job descriptions and tenure expectations among tenure-track librarians. While only nine percent of respondents said that publishing was given weight in their job description, a full seventy-seven percent stated that publishing was the most important priority for attaining tenure. Thirty-two percent of tenure-track librarians stated that reference and instruction work were least important when being judged for tenure.¹⁹ At the University of Colorado Boulder Libraries, teaching – a term meant to stand for the work of librarianship – is only given 40% weight in tenure and promotion decisions, and librarians are expected to spend as much time on scholarship as they do teaching.²⁰ When the work of librarianship is only one of several competing priorities, and expectations are focused on publishing, encouraging librarians to find time to assess instruction can be challenging.

Tagg examined the reasons behind faculty resistance to doing assessment work and found that the message of research being more important than teaching is communicated to faculty early and often, to the point that junior faculty are sometimes actively discouraged from focusing on instructional improvement.²¹ The problem is not that faculty librarians do not care to assess and improve student learning, but that reward systems disincentivize those efforts. Tagg argues that tying teaching more strongly to tenure and promotion decisions is critical to motivating faculty to improve instruction.²² In her work applying John Kotter's change model to building a culture of assessment, Farkas argues that in order to anchor change in the culture, barriers to assessment must be removed, and structures, such as promotion and tenure, should be altered to encourage assessment work.²³ By not listing participation in assessment activities as a key criterion for performance appraisal, libraries disincentivize assessment work for busy faculty members.

Learning Communities in the High Performance Model and in Assessment Cultures

Tagg argues that collaboration is vital to changing attitudes amongst faculty around instructional improvement. He cites the collaborative development work undertaken by faculty at Al-

verno College, an institution well-known for its exceptional assessment work, as an ideal way to get faculty to move towards creating a culture of instructional improvement and assessment.²⁴ Loacker and Mentkowski, both from Alverno College, discuss the idea of a *scholarship of assessment*, in which faculty “actively pursue systematic inquiry on assessment as a member of a community of professionals.”²⁵ They argue that the learning that comes from doing assessment is greatly amplified by sharing and discussing results with one's peers. This allows for multiple meanings to arise from looking at the same results and for results from multiple faculty members to influence practice among each member of the group.

This model for building collaboration through faculty learning communities is consistent with the High Performance Programming framework. According to Nelson and Burns, high performance organizations recognize the value of informal groups in organizations and believe that they can be harnessed to improve performance and commitment.²⁶

The importance of building cohesive and supportive teams focused on instructional improvement cannot be overstated, but creating such an environment among faculty can be difficult. Phipps writes about team learning being focused “on the learning of the team, not on individual contributions; a genuine thinking together, dialoguing, suspending assumptions, discovering insights together.”²⁷ In a faculty-led library, where the focus is on the individual and his or her work, this requires a significant culture shift. One way to spark that shift is through collaborative learning. At the University of Wollongong, library leaders sought to create commitment to assessment and team cohesiveness through staff development. This first step helped move the organization towards a stronger assessment program.²⁸ Angelo states that faculty learning communities can only come about through trust, shared vision and goals, shared mental models, and shared guidelines for doing assessment.²⁹ Similarly, Phipps highlights the importance of commitment to a shared vision amongst members of the team to provide a sense of direction and energy. She argues that

this vision must come from the team itself rather than being imposed by leaders.³⁰

These ideas about forming learning communities are predicated on the idea of the faculty determining the vision and direction of assessment work, a notion quite consistent with a faculty governance model. Many articles in the literature of higher education about building a culture of assessment stress the importance of the direction of the assessment push coming from faculty and their concerns. Giving library faculty and staff ownership over the program will almost certainly increase buy-in. Many of the common faculty concerns about assessment – that it runs counter to academic freedom, that results could be used against faculty or departments, and that it is focused on accountability³¹ – would be significantly mitigated by a faculty-led assessment effort.

This model of faculty teams or learning communities requires time to develop. Creating a sense of cohesiveness, commitment, and shared values does not happen overnight. Assessment teams are often tasked with specific activities as soon as they are formed without the opportunity to develop their own culture. Rather than take that route, the assessment committee at Queensborough Community College spent two years learning about and discussing assessment theories and techniques together. By becoming a learning community first, they were able to build trust cohesiveness and a collective sense of responsibility for assessing student learning.³² Learning about assessment as a group can help faculty and staff develop a common vocabulary and common frame of reference, both of which can help build consensus in the development of an assessment program. Assessment by its very nature is collaborative, but building true collaboration takes time. Like building a high performance organization, an immediate focus on results will not build a culture of assessment; a focus on creating a learning culture and group cohesiveness is key.

Building a Learning Community at the Portland State University Library

Portland State University is a large urban university that serves a diverse population. Library

staffing is low relative to comparable institutions, with 15.6 FTE librarians providing instruction to a population of nearly 30,000 students. A strong and successful subject liaison model has existed for decades at the Portland State University Library and has resulted in strong relationships between librarians and academic departments on campus. The subject librarians are deeply engaged with their assigned departments and have historically operated as independent actors in their instruction work. Librarians at Portland State are also tenure-track faculty and, while working in full-time 12-month positions, are expected to adhere to the same standards for scholarship and service as traditional teaching faculty. Until 2011, when a head of instructional services (Farkas) was hired, there was no formal coordination of the instruction program and each librarian determined his or her own goals. There also was no group or forum within the library to discuss pedagogical issues and assessment. Those wanting to improve their teaching had to take the individual initiative to do so, which in a tenure track environment took time away from research and service. While a few liaisons conducted assessments of their teaching and student learning, any coordinated assessment pushes over the years had been focused on assessing faculty and student satisfaction rather than learning.

Concurrent with the hiring of a head of instructional services came several ambitious goals related to instruction and assessment in the library's strategic plan for FY 2012-2014.³³ While the team involved in strategic planning included representation from library public services, the strategic plan did not go through a thorough internal vetting process, stemming primarily from the departure of the interim university librarian who had been leading the process. As a result, many instruction librarians did not feel a strong sense of ownership for some of the stated goals. While a number of the goals were met in the first year, it was sometimes difficult to secure faculty involvement or buy-in. Coupled with unclear administrative expectations regarding instruction and assessment at a time when most of the library administrators had interim status, there were undercurrents of anxiety around these topics. At the time, with a lack of clear expectations and a focus on individual



goals and welfare, the library exhibited some characteristics of a reactive organization.

Not surprisingly, in this organization-in-transition, the new head of instruction ran up against barriers in developing learning outcomes and working toward other goals in the strategic plan. While the instruction librarians all expressed a desire to do more assessment, the lack of a clear and shared vision tacitly encouraged the tenure-track librarians to focus on those things on which they knew they would be judged. Since the head of instruction, a middle management position, could not effect change at the administrative level, she could only work on those areas that were within her limited reach and try to develop an instructional culture separate from the larger library culture. By the end of her first year, Farkas had realized that faculty development, rather than moving toward externally identified targets, was the focus that would build capacity for lasting change. The High Performance Programming framework suggested that focusing on empowerment, culture-building, and visioning within the instruction program might help create more cohesiveness among the instruction librarians and more of a focus on achieving programmatic goals. Knowing that in the reactive frame the focus is on self-preservation, focusing on supporting the instruction librarians in their work also became a key goal. Instead of piling on more initiatives and expectations, what the instruction librarians needed was support, a sense of community, and a feeling of agency over the goals for library instruction.

Building a cohesive learning community became an important goal for Farkas, and she instituted monthly instruction meetings designed to provide a forum in which to discuss issues related to instruction. While the instruction librarians expressed interest in discussing teaching and assessment, early meetings were marked by few contributions and much silence. In June 2012, the instruction librarians met in an all-day retreat to discuss pedagogical issues, develop questions they had regarding student learning that could be answered through assessment, and determine the group's goals for the following year. This retreat signaled a turning point for the instruction librarians. By determining their own

goals and charting their own course, the librarians took some ownership of instructional improvement. One important goal was to create a repository of learning objects and assessment tools that librarians could share and reuse. This repository, created in winter 2013, added significantly to the instruction librarians' tool-kit.

In subsequent instruction meetings, librarians were more willing to share their experiences and discuss both good and bad instructional experiences. The meetings included lively discussions on topics such as formative assessment and teaching critical thinking. Farkas also initiated a voluntary reflective peer coaching program, based on the model articulated by Vidmar,³⁴ which helped instruction librarians develop more of a practice of self-assessment. The ten librarians who participated in this program over two academic quarters reported learning a great deal from the activity and wished to continue the program. In summer 2013, half of the instruction librarians conducted their first program-level assessment, using a rubric to assess freshman research papers. These small steps toward collaboration, trust-building, and experimentation around assessment and improvement of student learning are vital and should form the foundation for further improvements in assessment.

This case study highlights the importance of developing a shared vision and of forming informal communities to support organizational priorities, especially in the absence of a larger institutional vision. When leadership is in transition, vision can be in short supply, and this can lead to characteristics of a reactive organization, where employees are focused more on their individual work than on programmatic goals. Forming informal or formal teams around instruction and assessment can help to bring the focus back to the big picture and create shared vision at the level of the instruction program. In a faculty environment especially, those providing instruction should be empowered to develop their goals as a team, so long as they are consistent with the organizational vision and mission. Buy-in is not enough in an environment with so many competing priorities. Without a sense of ownership and commitment to a goal, librarians will prioritize those things that they

know count most towards tenure, which rarely include assessment.

Infusing Assessment into Instruction at the University Library of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

The University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is an internationally preeminent research university,³⁵ serving more than 30,000 undergraduate students and 12,000 graduate/professional students. The university library is highly-ranked³⁶ and has over 300 FTE professional and support staff, of which approximately one-fourth participate in programs that provide about 1,500 instruction sessions to 25,000 participants each year. The organizational structure of the University Library at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is complex and multi-faceted.

Like the Portland State University Library, the University of Illinois Library has a long tradition of subject-specialty librarianship. Responsibilities of subject librarians evolved over time; they once included technical services duties as conceptualized in a “holistic librarianship” model, but currently focus on engagement, reference, instruction, collection development and management, and professional development.³⁷ Subject librarians have strong relationships with the faculty and students in the departments that they serve, in many cases built up through years of communication and cooperation. Subject-specialty librarianship, however, comprises only one part of the university library’s organizational profile. Equally important are the librarians in central public services and technical services units, who have responsibility for somewhat defined functional areas, as well as those in special collections units, who have public and technical services responsibilities for unique collections of archives, rare books, or other materials.

The university library also has a long history of faculty status for librarians. With librarians having had faculty rank since the 1940s and full faculty status since the 1970s,³⁸ the library’s organizational culture as well as administrative and work practices reflect the principles of shared governance, collegiality, and individual entrepreneurship as one would expect. Librarians

value their autonomy and flexibility, which enable them to pursue opportunities and innovations with minimal bureaucratic processes or layers of administrative approval and oversight. All faculty report to the dean of the library, regardless of their unit affiliation, and are evaluated annually by the Faculty Review Committee, which is comprised solely of library faculty members.

Until 2002, the User Education Committee, made up of library faculty, coordinated the university library’s instruction programs. As the programs grew in size, complexity, and strategic importance, the members of the committee determined that they had accomplished all they could with just a committee and advocated to establish a central coordinator for information literacy services and instruction (Hinchliffe). This faculty position is in the Office of the Associate University Librarian for User Services and is advised by the User Education Committee. On a related note, the creation of the coordinator for library assessment position followed the same path – a faculty committee that advocated the creation of a permanent position.

The coordinator for information literacy services and instruction conducted an initial needs assessment by meeting with all faculty during their division meetings (e.g., Physical Sciences and Engineering Division, Social Sciences Division, Technical Services Division.) as well as analysis of library reports and planning documents. The needs assessment revealed a demand for basic instructional infrastructure, with hands-on classrooms at the top of the list for the Main and Undergraduate Libraries, as well as a desire for models of instruction programs at research libraries and professional development opportunities. The library faculty repeatedly emphasized, as well, that the instruction programs currently offered were uniquely developed by library units or teams in response to user group needs and should not be homogenized lest they lose their effectiveness. In other words, library faculty wanted a supportive environment for continuing to innovate and develop responsive instructional programs but saw the value in doing so collectively and cooperatively. The High Performance Programming framework suggests that the library faculty were in a



high performing mode but lacked resources; as such the coordinator focused on the management roles of garnering resources and building infrastructure in order to empower librarians.

Library faculty also raised questions about whether the instruction programs were as effective as the librarians would like them to be and whether students were achieving the learning outcomes that were intended. Paralleling the development of a coordinated information literacy program in the university library has been the development of its assessment program. The university library's path to developing a culture of assessment has been described elsewhere in detail by Hinchliffe and Chrzastowski.³⁹ Of particular relevance to this case study is the lesson of the importance of attending to organizational culture and, in particular, faculty culture and the emphasis on publication as a very important criterion for tenure and promotion in developing the university library's assessment initiative. As the assessment program developed and strengthened, it served as a backdrop for infusing assessment into the university library's instruction programs and supporting librarians' desire to determine if those programs are effective and achieving their intended outcomes.

Harking back to the initial needs assessment conducted by the coordinator and the focus on empowerment, the key to infusing assessment in instruction has been professional development. Two librarians have attended ACRL's Assessment Immersion Program and one attended ARL's Service Quality Evaluation Academy with particular attention to how she might apply her new skills to teaching and learning efforts. The library has held an annual spring information literacy workshop, which has focused on assessment for a number of years – featuring Debra Gilchrist in 2011 on the assessment cycle and Megan Oakleaf in 2012 on rubrics. The User Education Committee has also hosted a number of webinars and speakers. Over time, more and more librarians are participating in the professional development opportunities and an increasing number are attending multiple sessions.

In 2013, the User Education Committee worked with the coordinator for assessment to extract

relevant assessment data from the library's Ithaka S&R Faculty Survey results and these data were then incorporated into the library's executive summary of findings. Subsequent discussions and opportunities for librarians to share their pilot approaches are resulting in an emerging informal group of librarians who are leaders for instructional assessment through their work and scholarship, facilitated and supported by the coordinator. This emergent "team" is predicted by the High Performance Programming model.

As interest grows in learning assessment, so too does the desire to share information and resources in transparent and multi-directional ways, demonstrating an increased interest in working collaboratively across the library. The User Education Committee is exploring mechanisms to respond to librarian requests for a repository for sharing instruction and assessment resources, particularly those that might be easily adapted for other user groups. Creating a system that allows flexibility and autonomy while standardizing procedures and workflow is a difficult task, but doing so also ensures growing adoption and use of the system once it is put in place.

This case study highlights the success that comes from working within one's organizational culture and capitalizing on its values and strengths. Though a great deal remains to be done, much has been accomplished in infusing assessment in the university library's instruction program. Continuing to use the High Performance Programming framework as a lens for reflecting on faculty culture and the culture of assessment will help guide future actions and development.

Conclusion

The High Performance Programming model provides a valuable framework for library instruction coordinators looking to infuse assessment into their instructional programs, particularly at institutions where librarians are faculty. The High Performance Programming model may also be valuable in any area of librarianship where managers and leaders seek to build a strong shared vision and commitment, regard-

less of faculty status. Future case studies could and hopefully will explore this. What these two cases demonstrate is that the notion of empowered employees structured around formal and informal teams and focused on service quality is facilitated by the affordances of faculty governance and the ideal conditions for building an assessment culture. Creating learning communities around teaching and assessment can help build a sense of shared vision and purpose among library faculty and further a library's path to achieving the high performing organizational frame.

For those who are convinced of the value of the High Performance Programming model for organizational change, we end with some practical advice for getting started based on our experiences at Portland State University and University of Illinois. The comparison chart of the reactive, responsive, proactive, and high performing organizational frames is a powerful diagnostic tool for assessing a library's current approach to the various dimensions (e.g., management focus and communication). Noting areas of weakness and strength relative to the high performing frame will give a library leader insight into areas for focused organizational development efforts. For libraries characterized primarily as reactive or responsive, organizational development might first start with administrative self-review focused on the most relevant organizational frames. Though it can be tempting to focus on areas of weakness, it is equally important to note areas of strength and consider strategies for continuing to nurture those strengths, perhaps even using them to catalyze growth in weak areas. While no framework can direct specifically the steps one must take to achieve organizational transformation, the High Performance Programming model offers insights for leading change via commitment rather than administrative control and capitalizing on the values and characteristics of faculty culture.

Endnotes

¹ Amos Lakos and Shelley E. Phipps, "Creating a Culture of Assessment: A Catalyst for Organizational Change," *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 4, no. 3 (2004): 352.

² Meredith Gorran Farkas, Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe, and Amy Harris Houk, "Creating a Culture of Assessment: Determinants of Success" (presentation, Association of College and Research Libraries 2013, Indianapolis, IN, April 12, 2013).

³ Linda Nelson and Frank L. Burns, "High Performance Programming: A Framework for Transforming Organizations," in *Transforming Work: A Collection of Organizational Transformation Readings*, ed. John D. Adams, (Alexandria, VA: Miles River Press, 1984).

⁴ Michael Beer, "How to Develop an Organization Capable of Sustained High Performance: Embrace the Drive for Results-Capability Development Paradox," *Organizational Dynamics* 29, no. 4 (2001): 233-247; Rob Cross, Jane Linder, and Andrew Parker, "Charged Up: Managing the Energy That Drives Innovation," *Management Quarterly* (2007): 14-30; Howard M. Guttman, "The Accountable Leader," *Leader to Leader* (2009): 47-51; Noreen Heraty, and Michael Morley, "The High-Performance Organization: Developing Teamwork Where It Counts," *Management Decision* 33, no. 2 (1995): 56-65; Gail A. Wolf and Pamela K. Greenhouse, "A Road Map for Creating a Magnet Work Environment," *Journal of Nursing Administration* 36, no. 10 (2006): 458-462.

⁵ Nelson and Burns, "High Performance Programming", 240

⁶ Guttman, "The Accountable Leader," 47-48.

⁷ Peter B. Vaill, "The Purposing of High-Performing Systems," *Organizational Dynamics* 11, no. 2 (1982): 26.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 240-241

⁹ *Ibid.*, 228-235.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 226.

¹¹ Beer, "How to Develop," 244.

¹² Lakos and Phipps, "Creating a Culture of Assessment," 350-356.

- ¹³ Daniel J. Ennis, "Contra Assessment Culture." *Assessment Update* 22, no. 2 (2010): 1.
- ¹⁴ Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe and Tina E. Chrzastowski, "Getting Started with Library Assessment: Using Surveys to Begin an Assessment Initiative," in *Proceedings of the Library Assessment Conference: Building Effective, Sustainable, Practical Assessment, Charlottesville, VA, September 25-27, 2006*. <http://libraryassessment.org/bm~doc/proceedings-lac-2006.pdf>, 64-67.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 64
- ¹⁶ Shelley E. Phipps, "The System Design Approach to Organizational Development: The University of Arizona Model," *Library Trends* 53, no. 1 (2004): 73.
- ¹⁷ John Tagg, "Why Does the Faculty Resist Change?" *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning* 44, no. 1 (2012): 11-13.
- ¹⁸ Steve McKinzie, "590: Local Notes - Tenure For Academic Librarians: Why It Has to Go," *Against the Grain* 22, no. 4 (2010): 60.
- ¹⁹ Corey M. Johnson and Elizabeth Blakesley Lindsay, "Why We Do What We Do: Exploring Priorities Within Public Services Librarianship," *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 6, no. 3 (2006).
- ²⁰ Janet Hill, "Wearing Our Own Clothes: Librarians as Faculty," *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 20, no. 2 (1994): 71.
- ²¹ Tagg, "Why Does the Faculty," 11-13
- ²² *Ibid.*, 13-14
- ²³ Meredith Farkas, "Building and Sustaining a Culture of Assessment: Best Practices for Change Leadership." *Reference Services Review* 41, no. 1 (2013), 13-31.
- ²⁴ Tagg, "Why Does the Faculty," 13-14.
- ²⁵ Marcia Mentkowski and Georgine Loacker, "Enacting a Collaborative Scholarship of Assessment," *Building a Scholarship of Assessment*, ed. Trudy W. Banta, (San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons, 2002), 83.
- ²⁶ Nelson and Burns, "High Performance Programming", 240.
- ²⁷ Shelley E. Phipps, "Transforming Libraries into Learning Organizations," *Journal of Library Administration* 18, no. 3 (1993): 19-37.
- ²⁸ Margie H. Jantti, "Developing a Culture That Values the Need for Assessment and Continuous Improvement: The Growth of a Learning Organisation," in *The Performance Measurement for Libraries and Information Services Conference, Sydney, AU, 21-22 March 2005*. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/asdpapers/21/>.
- ²⁹ Thomas A. Angelo, "Doing Assessment as if Learning Matters Most," *AAHE Bulletin* 51, no. 9 (1999): 3-4.
- ³⁰ Phipps, "Transforming Libraries," 32-33.
- ³¹ Don Haviland, "Why Are Faculty Wary of Assessment?" *Academic Leadership Journal* 7, no. 3 (2009).
- ³² Robert Becker, "Implementing an Assessment Program: A Faculty Member's Perspective." *Academic Leadership Journal* 7, no. 1 (2009).
- ³³ Portland State University Library, "Strategic Plan 2012-2014," Accessed August 28, 2012, http://library.pdx.edu/strategic_plan.html.
- ³⁴ Dale Vidmar, "Reflective Peer Coaching: Crafting Collaborative Self-Assessment in Teaching." *Research Strategies* 20, no. 3 (2005): 135-148.
- ³⁵ The University of Illinois ranked #33 in the Times Higher Education World University Rankings in 2012-2013 (<http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/world-university-rankings/2012-13/world-ranking>) and #56 in the U.S. News and World Report's World's Best Universities 2012 (<http://www.usnews.com/education/worlds-best-universities-rankings/top-400-universities-in-the-world?page=3>).
- ³⁶ In 2012, the University Library ranked #12 in the ARL Investment Index (interactive version of the ARL investment index is available online at <http://www.arlstatistics.org/analytics>).

- ³⁷ University Library, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, "Template/Menu of Core Roles and Responsibilities: Subject Specialist Librarians," (2012), Accessed August 30, 2012,
http://www.library.illinois.edu/committee/exec/supplement/s2011-2012/Template_MenuofCoreRolesandResponsibilitiesSubjectSpecialistLibrarians.html
- ³⁸ Robert G. Sewell, "Faculty Status and Librarians: The Rationale and the Case of Illinois." *College and Research Libraries* 44. No. 3 (May 1983): 212-22.
- ³⁹ Hinchliffe and Chrzastowski, "Getting Started with Library Assessment," 64-67.