

CHAPTER 14

Moving from In Person to Online

Effects on Staffing in a Large Academic Library System

Emma Popowich and Sherri Vokey

Setting the Change Stage

The University of Manitoba (U of M) is a research-intensive medical and doctoral-level university and a member of the U15 Group of Canadian Research Universities, which includes fifteen of Canada's top research universities. In support of the U of M's strategic priorities, distributed campuses, and over 100 programs, the University of Manitoba Libraries (UML) comprises eleven libraries that are distributed over two campuses within the city of Winnipeg. While most of the libraries' general operations, physical collections, and staff are located at the Fort Garry campus, the Health Sciences library is housed at the downtown medical campus.

In 2015–2016, the UML reported a staffing complement of 180 librarians and support staff.¹ Organizational changes were instituted in June 2016 that affected many areas within the libraries, and they were felt acutely in public services where support staff positions were reduced. Traffic, circulation, and reference trends at the UML closely mirrored those reported widely within academic libraries: services and resources are increasingly moving toward online environments, and after several years of consistent decreases in face-to-face informational and circulation transactions, frontline service staff in academic libraries are being reduced and redeployed.²

A sweeping reorganization of the UML's public services staffing model was instituted in an effort to be responsive to these trends. In addition to the layoff of support staff across multiple units that left managers struggling at times to keep libraries adequately staffed and open, remaining service desk staff were expected to refocus their priorities. Support staff, who for so long were evaluated on and lauded for their commitment to public service suddenly felt devalued and questioned their future in academic libraries. At the same time, librarians who were endeavoring to support new faculty services and library-based initiatives were left clamoring for support from library assistants who were now in short supply.

I. Warm-up Phase

Stage 1: Establishing a Sense of Urgency

The discontinuance of library support staff positions in public services and subsequent reorganization of roles presented a number of challenges for library unit heads. The impact of the staffing reduction on the institution remains contentious. Several sources reported that close to forty support staff positions were lost due to restructuring,³ though the university librarian stated that "30 low-level, part-time positions" were lost, the equivalent of "about nine full-time slots."⁴ Unions representing both support staff and librarians decried the negative impact that the

restructuring had on morale, workload, and services provided in support of research, teaching, and learning at the university.⁵

Any restructuring initiative, especially one involving the loss of colleagues, will have deep ramifications for individuals directly impacted by layoff and for those who remain. A report published by the Conference Board of Canada used the phrase “survivor syndrome,” defined as “a marked decrease in motivation, engagement, and productivity of employees that remain at the company as a result of downsizing and workforce reductions.”⁶ After layoffs were finalized and restructuring complete, many UML support staff reported mourning the loss of their colleagues and feeling stressed by the impact on their unit and individual workload. Moreover, many reported feeling that the security of their employment was in jeopardy because the layoffs made them feel expendable, especially when the libraries seemed to be moving increasingly in the direction of self-service options, such as self-checkout kiosks, reserve and holds lockers placed outside of library spaces, online room booking software, and self-guided video tutorials intended to reduce the number of face-to-face lab and classroom contact hours between students and library staff.⁷

While they were working to reorganize workload and responsibilities, it became apparent to library unit heads that many staff were feeling decreased satisfaction in their work life and ambivalence toward their employer. Unit staffing levels had been reduced to a bare minimum required to cover hours of opening, and while daytime staff struggled to attend to needs at service points and attend to off-desk duties, evening staff were underutilized. Librarians found their support staff colleagues were now largely unavailable to them, due either to misaligned hours of work or to increased time spent covering tasks previously completed by discontinued staff.

Unit heads began to meet regularly with librarians and support staff to identify the roadblocks to achieving strategic goals and priorities. Librarians were clear in their need for assistance from support staff in areas such as chat reference, instructional support, collections management, and website maintenance. Support staff were frustrated at their inability to assist due to hours spent staffing evening and weekend hours with little to no patron interaction.

After gathering similar feedback from units across the system, the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library advocated for a modified schedule of staffed and unstaffed hours. Further, they requested a greater degree of communication from administration about strategic directions in the area of self-service technologies and the future of user services at the UML in order to allay concerns about job security and value within the organization. Modest improvements have been made in efforts to communicate change and library priorities to faculty librarians via council meetings, but little change has been felt in practices around communication with all staff system-wide. This is compounded by the fact that the library system remains without a strategic document to guide such discussion.

Stage 2: Creating the Guiding Coalition

The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library initiated a project with the goal of advocating to administration for changes that would improve service and morale. The team was motivated by resolve and desperation to improve a chaotic and burdensome staffing arrangement that was bringing undue hardship upon support staff, librarians, and managers. Libraries Administration gave consent for the two heads to move their agenda forward, but were not interested in delving into the details of these changes. So long as there were no associated costs or negative consequences, the process could move forward without supervision from the administrative team. These two heads represented two of the three largest library units, and together represent the two main U of M campuses. The head of the third largest unit was invited to join the team, but declined. While having the “big three” units represented would have been ideal for pulling together a strong and robust guiding team, it did not detract from the achievement of the team’s objectives. Staff were very familiar with the heads who were involved and were keen to see some response to their concerns. In this sense, support staff and librarians saw the changes led by the two heads as representing their interests.

The team established four priorities: (1) reduce staffed hours to allow for an increase in staffing during peak and in-demand service hours; (2) increase support to librarians from support staff; (3) increase the amount of fulfilling, high-level work for support staff; and (4) improve morale and work satisfaction.

Stage 3: Developing a Vision and Strategy

The heads created a vision that anchored proposed changes in the creation of cohesiveness between support staff and librarians. The vision involved creating a sustainable support staff service model that allowed this group to fulfill dual roles: to contribute to student success through reference work, and to support librarian activities by working collaboratively with their librarian colleagues. The upshot of greater collaboration would be an improvement in overall job satisfaction in the newly restructured environment, while remaining committed to the evolving strategic priorities of the UML. The core tenet of this vision and plan centered around a significant reduction in staffed hours at service desks.

The development of the vision and strategy needed to reflect the needs of the UML system as a whole, the university librarian’s priorities, and the university’s strategic plan. In order to move forward, the team needed to demonstrate how proposed staffing changes would provide additional support to significant UML priorities such as research support and instructional services. Financial accountability was also key, as a reduction in costs and in library closures due to staffing shortages was fundamental in securing the university librarian’s support. Furthermore, the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library needed to convey to library administration that by accepting the proposed changes, the UML would be in lockstep with staffing strategies found across comparable Canadian university libraries.

The two heads wrote a staffing proposal for the university librarian in April 2017 that reviewed Canadian U15 library staffing and service models. They discovered that across Canada, U15 libraries were overwhelmingly moving to a tiered service level model with staffed

information desks closing earlier in the evening while the library building remains accessible late into the evening or “after-hours” without library staff.⁸ The premise of a tiered model involves staffing information service points strategically and during times of peak demand, primarily during the day and early evening.

The two heads argued that by using a tiered service model, the UML could reduce staffing costs, such as overtime, while providing longer hours of opening, access to space, and self-serve options. This involved limited staffed library hours with unstaffed, after-hours access made available in conjunction with security services. Further, they argued that a tiered model would help staff see the adoption of self-service options not as a threat, but as a net advantage to their work lives. Through the adoption of the heads’ proposal, support staff would be freed from staffing service points during non-peak times and instead would be working at hours that correspond with those that are most impactful for students. The tiered service model also allowed support staff to see themselves as supporting librarians in more challenging roles instead of staffing study halls or empty buildings. An increase in the concentration of staff during core daytime hours translated into greater support for higher-level work and the development of new initiatives. Fortunately, both administration and library staff understood and accepted this strategy.

Stakeholders from outside the libraries, primarily deans and department heads, were also consulted during this process. The proposed changes were explained with a view to highlighting the overall increase in their library’s hours rather than the reduction in staffed hours. Affected deans were supportive of the proposed changes and in fact stated a preference for increased support staff and librarian assistance for research and teaching over longer staffed hours.

With major stakeholder support secured, the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library embarked on a three-phase approach to implementing our proposed changes. The reduction in staffed hours was planned within a multiphase, multiyear time frame. Each phase required that specific strategies and steps be followed in order to successfully see us through to the following phase.

Phase 1

In September 2017, the three largest libraries (Sciences and Technology, Health Sciences, and Humanities and Social Sciences) reduced their staffed hours while extending overall hours of access to library space. This was accomplished by supplementing staffed hours with unstaffed hours with the assistance of private security. In the new model, large libraries would be staffed from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., and remain open and unstaffed until 1:00 a.m., or for twenty-four hours during exam periods. This meant that staff who had previously worked until closing at 11:00 p.m. in the larger units would have their shifts moved into the busier part of the day. Smaller units would see staff moved up even earlier, with staffed hours running from 8:30 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. and unstaffed hours extended to 10:00 p.m.

While an overall increase in hours of access to the large unit libraries was well received by stakeholders, it did present immediate implications for some library services. For example, the

UML's chat reference service, which had traditionally been monitored by support staff while they worked at the service desk, was now without staffing in the later evening hours. With service desk staff ending their workdays earlier, chat reference hours would also need to be reduced. The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library investigated new ways of providing chat service, and although allowances were made for reduced chat reference hours for an interim period (2017–2018), there are plans to assign a dedicated chat reference staff member from September 2018 forward.

A reconsideration of safety and security in this new context also became an important component of the staffing plan. As managers, the two heads were concerned about staff finding themselves in situations where they were working alone. Through consultation with library support staff, support staff supervisors, and heads, the team concluded that staff working in large, multilevel units could not be permitted to close libraries alone. They liaised with the university's Environmental Health and Safety Office in drafting a "Working Alone Statement (Policy)" for all public service staff.⁹ The policy was approved by the libraries' management committee and now works to ensure that staff are protected from risk while working alone.¹⁰

Phase 2

The second phase began in April 2017 and entailed a change in the type of work assigned to support staff. No further changes to the hours were made, but rather a reduction of time spent on desk with an increase in non-desk duties was instituted. This included assigning higher-level work to support staff in line with their areas of interest and skill level.

With an increase in the number of self-service options being rolled out across library units, support staff were vocal about wanting new and challenging work. At the same time, newly articulated organizational priorities centering on research support and learning and instructional support services were overloading librarian workloads. The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library began to look at ways to shift to support staff some traditional liaison work that included but was not limited to collections management assistance, LibGuide (website) maintenance, events promotion and communication, and social media. The key to the success of this phase was in assigning work mindfully and in consultation with the support staff involved. Staff were consulted by unit heads and supervisors about their willingness to take on new work and their preferences and comfort levels. This step allowed staff to view the experience as a positive, self-directed change.

Phase 3

In the third phase, beginning in September 2018, the team reduced the staffed hours and increased overall opening hours in the remaining eight unit libraries in the UML system that were not initially impacted in phase 1. In this stage, allowances were made for these smaller unit libraries to be open and unstaffed all day on weekends and during non-peak times, which is a first in the UML system. This involved relying on security services to open these libraries and secure the space with no library staff on site. This model is tethered to self-service options such as self-checkout and also to a centralized online chat reference service that can be accessed by

students should they require assistance. We chose to use this unstaffed model to make units that previously had no opening hours during weekends to now be open and available, while at the same time reducing staffed hours in other units as a way to mitigate a negative perception of a reduction in staffed service. Student response to the change was positive and the overall increase in opening hours was seen as a direct response to student need by university administration. By the time of the final phase, support staff and librarians also understood the benefits of the transformation at hand.

Stage 4: Communicating the Change Vision

It was understood that the key to support of the vision would rest on effective communication, especially with frontline support staff and librarians. Staff commented repeatedly that one of the largest sources of discontent surrounding the 2016 reorganization was the lack of communication from library administration. The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library developed a communication plan for informing key stakeholder groups. Support staff would be informed as early as practicable and at regular intervals as progress was made through the stages. This group of frontline staff would receive the most in-person communication and the most thorough explanation of how the changes related to the evolution of libraries in keeping with UML strategic directions. Librarians would receive an overview of the change and how it would positively impact their work, but would be kept informed only at important and necessary junctures. Libraries Administration would be kept informed through our monthly management committee meetings and via email, but have preferred to be contacted only as needed during this process. Deans and department heads would require a more in-depth and in-person explanation of changes, primarily at the beginning stages of change implementation, but would not be inundated with detailed updates.

The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library developed consistent messaging for staff that was used at meetings and in discussions and directives by either of the two unit heads. They referred consistently to the future direction of academic libraries in general and to a commitment to moving the University of Manitoba's priorities forward when discussing the plan with staff. In other words, changes weren't being proposed or implemented without context, evidence, and thoughtful decision-making. Support staff received the highest amount of messaging, and individual unit staff and larger groups of support staff were met with regularly to discuss changes. Library supervisors were empowered to communicate the vision and to not be afraid of speaking out of turn about high-level priorities, which they tended to be excluded from. Librarians were also kept abreast of changes in meetings, but librarians have more daily communication with heads, and many of these discussions happened organically in conjunction with conversations about project deadlines and requests for support. Communication to Libraries Administration was more formal and often via email to make staffing requests such as alterations to job descriptions and reclassifications. Finally, communication with deans and department heads was done via an initial first meeting to present the groundwork for upcoming changes and then through email to update and ensure

continued support.

Whenever discussing an issue, solution, or outcome with staff, the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library made sure to reference it in the context of our priorities and goals as a system. Through these conversations, they came to learn that many support staff were not aware of the University of Manitoba's strategic plan or how it informed decisions at the library unit level. Initially, it may have appeared excessive, but consistent and contextualized messaging meant that support staff and librarians were never taken by surprise by any of the steps that were taken. Whether goals are defined internally within the libraries or externally within the university's articulated priorities, it is essential that staff be aware of these goals as an anchor to and reason for decision-making at the unit level.

II. Introducing New Practices Phase

Stage 5: Empowering Broad-Based Action

Perhaps one of the most challenging aspects of bringing the proposed changes to fruition involved empowering all of the affected staff to act in the interest of change. While a critical step in the change management process, it is one that was found to be largely out of the team's reach. Several barriers to organizational change were present and centered around hierarchical decision-making, organizational culture, vacancy management and succession planning, and fear of obsolescence.

Though the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library were responsible for articulating the proposed change, they often did not have the authority to make it a reality. Implementation of the plan was often subject to stops and starts while decisions and directives rested with library administration. A lack of nimble decision-making during crucial junctures presented challenges to sustaining momentum and confidence. At times the team took silences to be equal to assent, and by working as advisors to library administration, we were sometimes able to advocate for courses of action that would mitigate some organizational barriers.

The team often sensed that we were colliding with some staunchly held beliefs from UML staff and librarians around change: namely that the initial restructuring wasn't required and that the only solution was to revert to traditional models. Bringing people to accept that change is a necessary part of remaining relevant within the profession and continued growth was no small feat. Changing an organization's culture is challenging to say the least, and there were people who remained skeptical and unsupportive throughout, but they were not a majority. Being prepared with a solid communication plan and evidence to back up the proposed vision served to mitigate or quiet most of the opposition.

Throughout the project, the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library faced major obstacles around vacancy management at all levels in the organization, and discussions around succession planning were notably absent. This led to an inability to adequately involve supervisors and managers in the change management plan, as

many of those positions either sat vacant or were being temporarily staffed by people who might not be there for a substantial period of time.

After enduring unexpected layoffs, support staff were fearful of further job losses and had endured a period of rapid change in a relatively short amount of time. The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library strongly encouraged library administrators to post permanent library assistant positions within the first few months of our project to allow for greater staffing stability.

Additionally, some librarians were resistant to delegating tasks to library support staff for fear of becoming obsolete in *their* positions. The UML was initiating conversations around the dissolution of the traditional liaison model in favor of functional roles and responsibilities, and librarians were learning that they would soon divide their time between traditional liaison work and an additional functional role in areas like open journal software, data management, accessibility services, and so forth. This created some uncertainty for librarians and skepticism of the team's project. However, further clarification from administration regarding librarian priorities and strategic directions compelled librarians to become more involved in new tasks around research and instructional support. As they become more involved in these new ventures, they were less insecure about losing other tasks to support staff.

Stage 6: Generating Short-Term Wins

Barriers will always be present and introduce unwanted complexity to any change initiative. The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library were aware of the need to create visible successes as soon as possible post-implementation in order to sustain and continue to build momentum with key stakeholders. To that end, they were able to generate four short-term wins.

Approved Reclassifications

Support staff who moved into new and more demanding roles were rewarded with reclassification, often to the highest level (4) when in new positions providing reference services, providing support to librarians, performing supervisory duties, and so forth. This helped to bolster the support for the change that the team was leading.

Assignment of Dedicated Chat Reference Staff

The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library advocated forcefully for a dedicated staff member to assume responsibility for oversight of a nascent chat reference service, especially in the context of a reduction in staffed evening hours. Assigning someone to this role has helped solidify the idea that chat reference was a priority for the system. It further demonstrated that the voices of frontline librarians and support staff have been heard, as they had been very vocal about this need for a few years.

Student Satisfaction

The greatest fear for all participating in the change was the potential for disservice to

students, who might have less in-person access to assistance. Increased opening hours were key to obtaining support of students, who saw the increased access to group study rooms, printing services, and collections as a fair trade-off for a model with reduced staffed hours.

Improved Work-Life Balance for Support Staff

With support staff no longer working past 8:00 p.m. on any night of the week, there has been a marked decrease in the perceived inequity of shift distribution. This is perhaps the single most positive and impactful outcome that has led to vastly improved morale and job satisfaction among support staff. It has resulted in increasing overlap of staff during daytime hours and has meant that staff may now attend professional development events, collaborate with librarians and other support staff, and so forth.

Stage 7: Consolidating Gains and Producing More Change

The achievement of short-term gains were viewed as a big win by the team, though they recognized that in order to sustain forward movement and not risk falling into complacency, they needed to push for further organizational change. Much of the proposed plan focused on support staff and hinged on increasing their support and, by doing so, creating more challenging and rewarding work for them.

The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library have more recently refocused on the librarian model. Most librarians are tied to a traditional liaison model that organizes their work and priorities in a very specific way. This particular orientation to professional duties does not always prioritize the kind of innovative and synergistic team-based approach to work among support staff and librarians that the team was hoping for. In November 2017, health sciences support staff and librarians took part in an immersive two-day retreat and focused on how they could achieve greater collaboration. After much discussion and debate, the group came to consensus on the issue of librarian roles and advocated for a realignment of librarian duties around core strategic priorities. Each team will have at least one support staff member on board, and this is currently in the process of being deployed. Other units within the UML are looking to follow this approach and transition to a functional librarian model.

III. Grounding Phase

Stage 8: Anchoring New Approaches in the Culture

Throughout the three-year process of implementing a new staffing model, the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library modeled consistent communication and consultative, collegial decision-making. Librarians and support staff have come to expect effective and timely communication around changes and have begun to initiate conversations around change management themselves. In addition to increased communication, silos between librarians and support staff have been eroding, with teams forming organically

within units in order to tackle new initiatives.

The upskilling and reassignment of support staff to other off-desk duties remains a work in progress as new services are developed and rolled out to faculty and students. As the UML continues to evolve, greater opportunities for participation in higher-level work for support staff are presenting themselves. A number of librarians have transitioned into new roles as coordinators of identified priority areas such as Research Services.¹¹ With the development of these new roles comes a host of new challenges and issues in which support staff must become skilled and conversant. In the case of Research Services, upskilling for support staff is taking place around bibliometrics, persistent identifiers, and repository deposits, to name just a few. Though by nature the coordinator positions are cross-functional and system-wide in their scope, those occupying the new roles have taken steps to adopt the transparent and timely “culture of communication” that the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library have been keen to model throughout their change process. This has involved the use of blogs,¹² consultations with heads, and direct messages to all staff via email as appropriate.

Analysis and Conclusions

A number of key issues arose throughout this process that have been reframed as crucial aspects to successful change. It cannot be overstated how critical consistent and transparent communication is to the change process. Kotter and Rathgeber illustrate this point expertly in their book *Our Iceberg Is Melting*, in which the role of thinking and feeling is pivotal to effectively bringing people on board and sharing in the vision.¹³ *Thinking* differently can help change behavior and eliminate resistance. However, people need to be provided with adequate and logical communication in order to get there. In this case, the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library presented support staff and librarians with a rationale, vision, and strategy at the outset in order to create understanding among those affected by the change. Getting people to *feel* differently can lead to even more impressive returns. Again, in order to help people feel positively about change and even champion the plan as presented, it is essential for leadership to create a compelling picture of the future and everyone’s role on that journey.

The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library encountered several instances where staff were unaware that the university had strategic priorities that served as a link to what was being proposed under the new service model. The two heads have endeavored to instill a new culture of change in which people are informed, engage with work collaboratively, and are unafraid to face change. This culture can take root only in a context where a vision of the library in the future is communicated as something for all staff to work toward.

Kotter’s eight-stage process for leading change served as a valuable tool in the analysis of the changes that the head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library instituted at the UML. Specifically, it reinforced how essential the first two steps,

creating a sense of urgency and creating a guiding coalition, were to the successful progression through the later stages. Without a knowledgeable and motivated team who were positioned and ready with a well-researched call to action, there very likely would not have been any movement beyond the warm-up phase.

While the analysis of the case proceeds very linearly from step to step, in reality, there were many bumps and setbacks that found the team either waiting or circling back to previous steps or phases. Implied in the Kotter framework is the notion that successful change comes from following each of these steps, in order. The head of the Elizabeth Dafoe Library and the head of the NJM Health Sciences Library felt at times that there was some necessary fluidity in their process that is not a hallmark of Kotter's industry-focused approach. While Kotter's work may be less aligned with the comparatively flatter organizational cultures than are found in higher education, any library embarking on a process of organizational change would be well-served by following the steps laid out in this process.

Notes

1. Canadian Association of Research Libraries, *CARL Statistics | Statistiques de l'ABRC 2015–2016, Salaries | Salaires 2016–2017* (Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association of Research Libraries, September 2017, rev. October 24, 2017), http://www.carl-abrc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CARL-ABRC_Stats_Pub_2015-16-v2.pdf.
2. "Graph 1: Service Trends in ARL Libraries, 1991–2015," from *ARL Statistics 2014–15* (Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2015), <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/service-trends.pdf>.
3. Nick Martin, "U of M, Union Disagree Strongly on Library Staff Cuts," *Winnipeg (MB) Free Press*, June 10, 2016, <http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/local/u-of-m-union-disagree-strongly-on-library-staff-cuts-382525141.html>; Laurie Morris, "AESES Position Discontinuances at the University of Manitoba," email, June 10, 2016, <http://aesess.ca/um-libraries-correspondence/#aesessjune10>.
4. Mary-Jo Romaniuk, quoted in Garrett Williams, "The U of M Library Jobs Cut in Staff Restructuring," *Manitoban*, University of Manitoba, August 15, 2016, <http://www.themanitoban.com/2016/08/u-of-m-library-jobs-cut-in-staff-restructuring/28779/>.
5. Mark Hudson, "UMFA's Open Letter to All AESES Members," email, June 9, 2016, <http://aesess.ca/um-libraries-correspondence/#umfajune9>; Morris, "AESES Position Discontinuances."
6. Stephanie J. Creary and Lara Rosner, "Mission Accomplished? What Every Leader Should Know about Survivor Syndrome," Conference Board of Canada, executive action report, June 11, 2009, 2, <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/e-library/abstract.aspx?did=3084>.

7. Laurie Morris, “AESES’ Response Letter to President Barnard,” letter, July 7, 2016, <http://aesess.ca/um-libraries-correspondence/#aesesjuly7>.
8. This model is currently employed by eleven of the U15 libraries in Canada. All libraries included in the analysis employed security services during the hours when information desks were not staffed by library assistants. Others also included some of the following: closed or limited stack access, swipe card access, and student patrols.
9. “Working Alone Statement (Policy),” University of Manitoba Libraries, February 17, 2017, accessed on the University of Manitoba Libraries staff intranet, <http://staff.lib.umanitoba.ca/index.php?q=workingalone>.
10. The UML’s “Working Alone Statement (Policy)” is hosted on a staff-only intranet. Contact the authors for access.
11. “Library Support for Researchers,” University of Manitoba Libraries LibGuide, last updated May 2, 2019, <http://libguides.lib.umanitoba.ca/researchservices>.
12. *RSDS Blog*, University of Manitoba Libraries, accessed May 10, 2019, <http://libguides.lib.umanitoba.ca/researchservices/rsdsblog>.
13. John P. Kotter and Holger Rathgeber, *Our Iceberg Is Melting* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2006).

Bibliography

- Association of Research Libraries. “Graph 1: Service Trends in ARL Libraries, 1991–2015.” From *ARL Statistics 2014–15*. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries, 2015. <http://www.arl.org/storage/documents/service-trends.pdf>.
- Canadian Association of Research Libraries. *CARL Statistics | Statistiques de l’ABRC: 2015–2016, Salaries | Salaires 2016–2017*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Association of Research Libraries, September 2017, rev. October 24, 2017. http://www.carl-abrc.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/CARL-ABRC_Stats_Pub_2015-16-v2.pdf.
- Creary, Stephanie J., and Lara Rosner. “Mission Accomplished? What Every Leader Should Know about Survivor Syndrome.” Conference Board of Canada, executive action report. June 11, 2009. <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/e-library/abstract.aspx?did=3084>.
- Hudson, Mark. “UMFA’s Open Letter to All AESES Members.” Email, June 9, 2016. <http://aesess.ca/um-libraries-correspondence/#umfajune9>.
- Kotter, John P., and Holger Rathgeber. *Our Iceberg Is Melting: Changing and Succeeding under Any Conditions*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 2006.
- Martin, Nick. “U of M, Union Disagree Strongly on Library Staff Cuts.” *Winnipeg (MB) Free Press*, June 10, 2016. <http://www.winnipegfreepress.com/local/u-of-m-union-disagree->

[strongly-on-library-staff-cuts-382525141.html](#).

Morris, Laurie. "AESES' Response Letter to President Barnard." Letter, July 7, 2016.

<http://aesec.ca/um-libraries-correspondence/#aesecjuly7>.

———. "AESES Position Discontinuances at the University of Manitoba." Email, June 10, 2016. <http://aesec.ca/um-libraries-correspondence/#aesecjune10>.

University of Manitoba Libraries. "Library Support for Researchers." LibGuide, last updated May 2, 2019. <http://libguides.lib.umanitoba.ca/researchservices>.

———. *RSDS Blog*. Accessed May 10, 2019.

<http://libguides.lib.umanitoba.ca/researchservices/rsdsblog>.

———. "Working Alone Statement (Policy)." February 17, 2017. Accessed on the University of Manitoba Libraries staff intranet.

<http://staff.lib.umanitoba.ca/index.php?q=workingalone>.

Williams, Garrett. "The U of M Library Jobs Cut in Staff Restructuring." *Manitoban*, University of Manitoba, August 15, 2016. <http://www.themanitoban.com/2016/08/u-of-m-library-jobs-cut-in-staff-restructuring/28779/>.