

Consolidation: A Tale of Two Libraries

Jeffrey J. Heck, Kathy J. Davies, Fay L. Verburg, Marianne Brown, Virginia L. Loveless, Sandra L. Bandy, and Brenda L. Seago

Abstract

This paper describes the initiating action, planning, adaptations, and official conclusion of a one-year consolidation of a professional health-sciences library with a largely commuter-student undergraduate liberal arts library, during the consolidation of their corresponding universities. Ties existed between some university programs, such as nursing, but the cultures of the two universities differed. The structure established to handle the consolidation allowed effective communication and cooperative development of policies and processes. Reaccreditation efforts also required extensive work to reflect the new university. Crucial lessons were learned from the intensive effort.

Introduction

Consolidation serves as one tool available to statewide education regulatory groups such as a board of regents, who seek cost-saving measures in higher education. Two Georgia universities recently completed a consolidation, finding a natural fit in combining a professional health-sciences university with a largely undergraduate liberal arts university. While there were obstacles to completing the consolidation, including the cultures of the universities, the consolidation has been completed and development toward a comprehensive high-level research university has begun. The consolidation was cooperative, and it involved joining two libraries with different foci in the span of one year.

Board of Regents Action

A Special Committee on Consolidation of the Board of Regents (BOR) of Georgia voted January 10, 2012, to mandate a consolidation of four pairs of University System of Georgia (USG) institutions to produce cost efficiencies, remove duplicate programs, and streamline administrations. In the case of the Augusta institutions, the consolidation joined a health sciences university and medical enterprise (Georgia Health Sciences University, a Carnegie enrollment profile majority graduate/professional classified university) and a medium liberal arts university (Augusta State University, a Carnegie high undergraduate classified university), with the intent to create a comprehensive, top-level research university. The consolidation joins a largely undergraduate body of about 7,000 students and 250 full-time faculty with a mostly professional-student body of 2,500 and 950 faculty.

The Medical College of Georgia, renamed as Georgia Health Sciences University (GHSU) in 2010, was chartered as the Medical Academy of Georgia in 1828, the state's primary center for medical professional education. Augusta State University (ASU) was chartered as the Junior College of Augusta in 1925, changed from Augusta College to ASU in 1996, and served as a primarily local, growing toward regional, commuter university for the Augusta area. The two institutions are about two and a half miles apart.

Background

Consolidation can be viewed as the endpoint of existing collaborative initiatives between Augusta State University and Georgia Health Sciences University. One model for consolidation begins with informal collaborations and leads to affiliation agreements or consortia partnerships before the final coalition into a new institution.¹ Greenblatt Library and Reese Library provided selected access and assistance to students of each institution prior to consolidation. Both libraries also participated in a University System of Georgia (USG) consortia agreement for GALILEO (a state-wide university-system consortia agreement for sharing databases and an integrated library system), providing more than 350 databases to the university system, and an agreement for circulation of books without cost to students or faculty.

Consolidation blends two existing universities into a newly created institution as opposed to a merger of one institution into an existing university. Georgia Regents University is an example of a cross-sector consolidation of two universities with different cultures and student populations.² The challenges of consolidation are found in key areas of shared governance, academic role, and research vs. teaching focus. Planning for a consolidation needs to address both infrastructure and personnel costs.

The successful transition of personnel into the new university is the most difficult goal for any consolidation. Cultural values can be a particular source of conflict if balanced representation from both locations is not present during the strategic planning process. It is critical to provide constant communication of changes and to demonstrate the advantages of consolidation. The Library Consolidation Work Team (hereafter referred to as the Library Work Team or LWT) had members from both campuses and constantly consulted colleagues within each library.

Consolidation initially occurs at the administrative level. However, integration of departments and institutes is necessary to sustain the new institution.³ Involvement of all staff is vital to developing commitment to the shared goals and mission of the new enterprise. Consolidation is an ongoing process with the greatest impact on the intangible issue of employee management. Threats to a successful consolidation include loss of personnel engagement, insufficient communication, and fear of job changes.⁴

A successful consolidation can result in expanded creativity, a dynamic mix of expertise, and enhanced research and teaching opportunities.⁵ A balance between centralized processes and the need for departmental flexibility is also vital to building the new university. Collaborative leadership encourages a sense of community for the new university.

Health Sciences Examples

Consolidation of an existing academic health sciences center and state university can result in a new institution that benefits from expanded educational programs, greater depth of faculty expertise, and institutional diversity as exemplified by the University of Toledo. The University of Toledo has been successful due to a clear understanding of consolidation benefits, strong strategic planning for the future, and a balanced approach to the integration of university cultures.⁶ Challenges included the financial cost, difficulty of change, and gaining support of alumni. The University of Colorado Denver also used a similar approach in building their consolidation process. Teams from both campuses were developed to address issues of institutional mission, teaching, research, engagement, and health care.⁷

Georgia Regents University created multiple Consolidation Work Teams and developed an administrative model of senior leadership presence on both campuses.

Academic Library Examples

Christina Flemming writes in her article, “A Joint University Library: Vision and Reality,” that common goals for the newly created joint library in Vaasa, Finland included the provision of print and e-resources for everyone at one location; joint license agreements for e-resources; a common learning center; one funding source for acquisitions; and first-class bilingual service.⁸

The libraries that merged had differing services, languages, collection, culture, and buildings. Each library had its own online public-access catalog (OPAC). Paramount to the merging of the Vaasa libraries was the formation of a new identity.⁹ The Reese and Greenblatt libraries share similar differences.

An important part of consolidation for the Finnish libraries was the documentation of all processes. Processes were available in a database accessible to all staff. Customer satisfaction surveys were routinely administered and adjustments to the library program were made accordingly. Collections also were evaluated on a continuing basis and staff feedback became an important part of the assessment process.

In the article, “College and University Mergers: Impact on Academic Libraries in China,” by Hong-Wei Huang, positive outcomes for libraries from university consolidation included: the enhancement of collections; combined acquisition budgets that benefitted smaller schools; the improvement of staff quality through restructuring of positions; higher level of library services offered; potential for increased funding to support library services and collections; and invigorated resource sharing.¹⁰

Challenges as outlined in the article addressed the possible elimination of positions and the reassignment of duties for personnel. The need for increased funding to support the research needs of new programs and additional funds for the overall infrastructure of the library and its collections were critical challenges as well.

The need to plan prior to the actual consolidation date is crucial according to the author. Drafting lists as regards personnel requirements, facilities' needs, consolidated policies and procedures, and other key areas is advantageous in the process of consolidation.¹¹ Two of the most important points the author makes in the article are, 1) that it will take many years to establish a collection that meets the teaching and research needs of the newly formed university, and, 2) that "maintaining harmony among the staff is the most important component of the merged library."¹²

Overall, lessons learned from academic library consolidation as reported in the literature focused on the importance of providing sustained and positive leadership; maximizing staff participation and buy-in; planning all aspects of the consolidation effort; and effective and timely communication among all participants.

Structure of university consolidation teams

To move forward with the consolidation of Augusta State University and Georgia Health Sciences University, the university's executive leadership had to be organized. This began with the Consolidation Working Group. The 21-member committee served in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor (the chief administrative office of the university system) and provided guidance to all the work teams. Membership included representatives from all aspects of the new university: staff council, academic affairs, medical center, alumni, human resources, finance, student government, facilities, community members, and undergraduate professors. The Reese Library associate director was a member of this group, representing ASU faculty, as a result of his governance work at ASU.

Project sponsors for this massive undertaking were the respective presidents of the two institutions. Working together, they provided high-level support, directives, and resources to all those involved in project leadership and support. The presidents assembled the Consolidation Action Team (CAT – Table 1) whose primary responsibilities were to receive and make recommendations to and from the Sponsors, Consolidation Working Group, and the work teams in areas pertaining to personnel, budget/resources, deliverables, and responsibilities.

A daily focus on consolidation was led by the CAT members, who met weekly for the duration of the planning and implementation process. CAT was composed of key leadership representatives from each institution, as shown in Table 1, below.

Initially, CAT identified 37 work teams essential to providing topical, specialized expertise and day-to-day planning and implementation for the consolidation of overlapping and unique departments/programs. The work teams were charged with resolving consolidation-related concerns in their respective areas including: preparing applicable sections of the SACS COC (Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges) Prospectus, developing short-term (1-2 years) and long-term (3-5 years) plans, merging existing policies and procedures, and constructing resource and staffing models.

The number and scope of the work teams expanded as the consolidation moved forward. A short two months after the two institutions began working together, there were 51 work teams (25 sub-

teams), engagement of 250 employees, over 50 planning documents submitted for CAT review, over 550 documents shared through a common communication plan, and over 300 scheduled meetings. (See Appendix 1)

Table 1 Consolidation Action Team

Consolidation Action Team Membership
Interim President, ASU
President, GHSU
Vice President for Business Operations, ASU
Vice President, Facilities Service, GHSU
Vice President for Academic Affairs, ASU
Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness, GHSU
Director of Public Relations and Publications, ASU
Vice President for Instruction & Enrollment Management & Associate Provost for Academic Affairs, GHSU
Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness & Research, ASU
Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs & Provost, GHSU
Director of Information Technology Services/Chief Information Officer, ASU
Chief Information Officer, GHSU
Senior Vice President of Communications & Marketing, GHSU

Library Work Teams

An overall Library Work Team (LWT) was established and met weekly to guide the libraries through consolidation planning. Key leadership on the LWT included the interim director of the health sciences Greenblatt Library, the director and associate director of the primarily undergraduate liberal arts Reese Library, business managers from both libraries, and chairs of reference and education from both libraries. The incoming director of Greenblatt Library joined by conference call soon after the LWT convened. The overall LWT was responsible for drafting the SACS Prospectus on library/learning resources, creating a consolidated organization chart, developing a strategic plan for the libraries, as well as approving all work by the sub-teams.

In order to complete the tasks given the Library Work Team and include input from as many faculty and staff in the consolidation process as possible, sub-teams were created. Each of the sub-teams had a specific charge and included faculty and staff from both libraries.

The Policies Sub-Team was charged with reconciling such disparate policies as those for circulation, interlibrary loan, GIL Express (a university system book-sharing process), reserves, special collections, use of electronic resources, library confidentiality and procedures for law enforcement visits and court orders, GALILEO workstation use, room reservations, Loansome Doc, services for differently-abled users, use of copyrighted materials, family room, weeding, collection development, the use of the libraries by minors, and institutional repository and records retention. This group revised policies and brought them back to the library work team for approval and

proposal for the university policy library, a central resource of institution-wide policies vetted by the legal office and the university administration.

The Faculty Governance Sub-Team was charged with developing a shared governance model for all faculty. This included drafting bylaws based on the model bylaws developed for the new university, approval by library faculty, nominating colleagues for office, and holding elections. As a result of the sub-team work, the Libraries are treated as a college for purposes of governance, host a Library Assembly (a meeting of the faculty as a whole), have bylaws posted, and have officers elected at the “college” and university level.

A Tenure Sub-Team was formed to examine tenure status for librarians because librarians at the undergraduate library were tenure-track, but librarians at the health sciences library were non-tenure track. The sub-team researched tenure and faculty status issues for librarians at other institutions and developed a white paper that was presented to the university administration. The white paper included a recommendation to allow new faculty hires to choose their path—either tenure or non-tenure track—but this recommendation was inconsistent with the new GRU promotion and tenure guidelines; future hires will be non-tenure track. A different library sub-team developed guidelines for promotion and tenure, but these were only finalized in May 2013 following approval and distribution of the university promotion and tenure guidelines.

Each Georgia Regents University college is responsible for developing customized promotion and tenure guidelines within university requirements. The university promotion and tenure guidelines were created by a work group to reflect the Board of Regents and the university administration’s intention to create a new, top-tier research institution. The former institutions had divergent missions, dissimilar student bodies, and different management cultures. The performance evaluations and promotion and tenure guidelines for each library reflected those differences. The library Promotion and Tenure Sub-Team was asked to create library guidelines that were acceptable to the director of libraries and the university promotion and tenure work group, on tight accreditation timelines. The new guidelines reflect the new university’s emphasis to become a comprehensive top-tier research level university by requiring most promotion and tenure committee members to be associate professor level or higher.

A Promotion and Tenure Committee was subsequently formed by the Library Assembly, the libraries’ shared governance group, which will be used to provide initial assessments of candidates’ preparedness for P&T application. With the exception of two faculty members who remain on tenure track but who did not yet have tenure prior to the consolidation, the committee will review only promotion applications, since no further applications for tenure will be made. From that committee, the applications will go forward to the “college” level libraries’ Promotion and Tenure Committee for official consideration. After review at the college level, the application moves to the Director of Libraries, the Provost, and a university-wide P&T Committee that ensures consistency in the college-level application of rules. While the university’s University Senate Bylaws call for one member of each college to serve on the overarching group, there are no current library employees who are associate professor or above who are not also administrators, and therefore no one is

eligible to serve on the university-level committee. This shortage may be addressed as several library faculty will go up for promotion in the next promotion cycle.

The libraries' Website Sub-Team was tasked with designing and implementing a new consolidated website for the University Libraries. They surveyed students, faculty, and staff regarding use of the existing library websites and also asked what features were desirable for the new design. A closed card sort exercise was performed to determine main user categories and common terminology. In a closed card sort, participants organize index cards with a predetermined term under predetermined category headings in a manner that makes sense to them. For example, a participant might place a card with the term "organizational chart" under the category "about us." The information gathered from the card sort exercise was used to construct a horizontal navigational bar to use as a common element across the consolidated website.

Because the university was moving to a new server and platform, the implementation of the navigational bar was delayed until a new university template for websites with new university logos and branding was made available (after the official consolidation date, January 8, 2013). Once guidelines and access to the content management system were established, the team started work on the construction of a consolidated home page, a main page for each library that is customized to its user population, and updated secondary pages.

The libraries Information Technology Sub-Team was charged with reviewing all non-website issues, such as off-campus authentication for databases and implementation of a common chat client. Their biggest challenge was in working with an outside vendor on an extremely tight timeline to consolidate the online catalog (Ex Libris Voyager run by the university system consortia) for both libraries. The work to combine the catalogs, containing more than 740,000 bibliographic records, began after the official consolidation and lasted almost four months.

While both libraries had unique resources for their specific users and these resources were renewed for the next fiscal year, a Content Management Work Sub-Team (CMWST) was needed to identify duplicate resources and allow negotiation of new licenses at a lower combined price.

Work began to identify the impact of the consolidation on the Libraries' budgets by listing serials packages/licenses, e-book providers, and paid databases including cost-share titles, consortium agreements, and individual subscriptions. The CMWST developed an in-house spreadsheet as a working document. Information gathered included fiscal year 2012 subscription costs, the projected costs for FY2013, license fee percentage increases per year, and service charges per acquisition. Most journal subscription packages renew on a calendar year, so the sub-team wanted to find out which pricing and licensing agreements would be the most affected by the consolidation. In order to review the journal packages, the sub-team ranked them by renewal dates, possible overlap in titles from the two campuses, and by the amount of money involved. The sub-team created an SBAR (situation, background, assessment, and recommendation) for each overlapping vendor/publisher package to allow comparison of pricing, to compare the price cap on each license, and to perform a content analysis. Library copies of invoices with "fixed titles" and journal package titles were compared and a decision was made to either merge the subscription or keep subscriptions

separate. Individual journal title duplications were canceled by one library and pricing for both campuses was negotiated.

In reviewing subscription rates, communication with vendors and publishers was very important. Both campuses' rates were based on one of two benchmarks, either the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education or student and/or faculty full-time equivalent (FTE). Consolidated student bodies typically meant a higher pricing structure. "Historical spend" was another factor that the libraries had to consider. Combining subscriptions did not necessarily mean one price for both campuses—the previous pricing from the each library had to be figured into the pricing negotiations with a new license. Since the library budgets weren't going to be consolidated until the next fiscal year, many invoices had to be split evenly or based on projected yearly spending before the consolidation.

Collection development policies had to be reviewed, and one document for both libraries was created to meet SACS accreditation requirements. Collection descriptions were expanded and the print/electronic resource selection criteria were revised to fit the needs of both libraries. The biggest change to our collection was moving the physical items of the nursing collection from one library to the other. This was necessitated by the decision of university administration to merge two undergraduate and graduate programs to one campus location. Only one duplicate electronic resource nursing collection was cancelled. The physical collection was reviewed and many older editions and duplicate copies were deleted from the collection. The final step in the process was moving the OPAC bibliographic records from one library location to the other. This was completed between semesters when most books were available and not on loan.

Strategic planning

The document provided by consolidation project managers to guide the consolidation transition short and long range planning was *Planning at Georgia Regents University* (<http://mcgsites.org/applications/transition/planning.php>). The document incorporated a three-tiered approach, the first of which was *strategic planning*, consisting of the enterprise's mission, (<http://gru.edu/about/mission.php>); vision, from the GRU Transition Forward plan; and values, from Strategic Priorities and Organizational Goals (<http://gru.edu/transitionforward/transition-forward-2013-03-28.pdf>).

Second tier, annual *unit planning* was employed in each organizational unit within the enterprise to develop unit goals, tactics, measures, and expected outcomes. The expected outcomes, whenever possible, were to be established with key performance indicators from authoritative sources. For the libraries, these indicators came from sources such as NCES (National Center for Education Statistics) datasets, ACRL (Association of College and Research Libraries) annual statistics, and AAHSL (Association of Health Sciences Libraries) data. Articles and publications such as the annual "Top Trends in Academic Libraries: A Review of the Trends and Issues Affecting Academic Libraries in Higher Education" appearing each year in *College & Research Library News* and ACRL's *Standards for Libraries in Higher Education*, October 2011, (<http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/standards/slhe.pdf>) helped inform the

[planning process](#). Also, to achieve certain tactics, actions were defined for day-to-day operations guided by policies, standard operating procedures, and project management techniques.

Third tier, *individual performance goals* link the unit goals, tactics, and actions to the goals of the employees of the enterprise. These goals were part of the performance planning and appraisal process and were defined in collaboration with the individual employee's supervisor. Performance is to be monitored on a yearly basis and assessed on the unit level. The goals and reported actions were expected to align with the strategic priorities and organizational goals of the enterprise.

During the 2012 pre-consolidation planning phase, the Library Work Team was charged with developing a comprehensive strategic plan that included a combined mission statement, vision, and values for the university libraries. These deliverables were required to be implemented within thirty days of the approval of the consolidation in January 2013 and were discussed in the SACS COC Prospectus. The Library Work Team, with review and comment from all employees of the libraries, drafted a mission statement, vision, and values aligned with those of the new consolidated university. These components, along with the University Libraries Strategic Plan described below, were approved pre-consolidation and ready for implementation within the 30-day timeframe post-consolidation.

In July 2012, there was a joint directive from the Institutional Effectiveness (IE) offices from both the GHSU and ASU campuses to create FY2013 Assessment Plans using a template provided by IE. To assist with the development of the deliverables in the three-tiered planning process, in the spring of 2012 the Library Work Team was directed to use an accountability management system to aid in formulating a short-range unit plan. This plan served as a transitional guide while the long-range strategic plans for Georgia Regents University and the GRU University Libraries were being developed.

In order to assist the planning and goal setting process, the Institutional Effectiveness staff offered multiple training sessions in August 2012 on each campus to introduce unit leaders to the process. The focus for FY2013 was to develop a single set of goals from both institutions representing the libraries anticipated consolidated unit. The institutional units were instructed to use the existing strategic plans of both institutions as guides and general principles in formulating goals. For Greenblatt Library the existing strategic plan was *Transformation 2020*; for Reese Library the existing strategic plan was *ASU in Action for Excellence, 2010-2015*.

The Library Work Team populated the management system template with three categories of short-term goals: Libraries consolidated goals, Greenblatt Library goals, and Reese Library goals. The individual library goals were based on previous unit planning by the individual libraries. The consolidated goals were crafted to steer the Library Work Team and sub-teams through FY13 consolidation planning.

Using the previously developed accountability management system-based plan, the Library Work Team developed strategic priorities and general goal areas, as well as short and long term goals, to craft a final version of the libraries' strategic plan using a newly approved format. Open forums with

library employees were held on both campuses for comment on the strategic plan and many revisions were made based on that feedback before the final version was completed.

The magnum opus of the Libraries' consolidation transition planning was the December 12, 2012, *Georgia Regents University Libraries Strategic Plan*, complete with an Executive Summary; Mission, Vision and Values; Strategic Priorities; Strategies; Organizational Goal Areas of Teaching, Research, Service, and Clinical Care; Short Term Goals; and the corpus of the Strategic Plan, 2012-2015. The Plan is organized by Organizational Goal Areas with each area having related Unit Goals. Each Unit Goal has Tactics, Actions, Measurement, Assessment Method, Reporting Frequency, Expected Outcome, Key Personnel Responsible, and 6-Month, 1-Year, and 3-Year Goals.

In conjunction with the Libraries Unit Plan and the University Libraries Strategic Plan, the vice-provost, to whom the University Libraries report, asked the director of libraries to produce a concise list of 100-day and 6-month deliverables. Progress reports on these deliverables were compiled at the end of each timeframe. This reporting allowed the vice-provost to keep track of the libraries' progress for briefing to the provost.

Other Cooperative Efforts

In addition to working together on documents required by the consolidation, the Libraries made a variety of efforts to help employees begin to work comfortably together. These included joint work on a major grant proposal, shared faculty-position search committees, the adoption of extended hours at finals with accompanying activities for both libraries, an annual picnic, a combined presentation at a Georgia User's Group Meeting (for Voyager), and sharing the normal celebrations of birthdays, births, etc. An evening/weekend non-exempt employee pay differential in place at GHSU was requested and provided for Reese Library.

Lessons Learned

The faculty and staff of both Greenblatt Library at the former Georgia Health Sciences University and Reese Library at the former Augusta State University are part of a process that continues to move Georgia Regents University's libraries forward in the post-consolidation environment. The need for rapid change under the pressure of an abbreviated consolidation timeline called for extraordinary measures in order to make decisions quickly. Looking back at the year and a half since the announcement of the consolidation of these two institutions with very different missions and cultures, there are definitely lessons learned that will well serve future leaders in similar circumstances.

- Acknowledge and embrace the complexity of each organization's culture and identity. Comprehensive academic libraries and academic health sciences center libraries are dissimilar, serving different primary clientele and providing diverse services, programs, and information resources. It is important to safeguard the core services, programs, and collections of each library's primary clientele while addressing the demands of new initiatives. From SACS Prospectus 2012: *Policies, procedures, programs, workflow,*

collections, and services that are identified as unique to and in the best interest of each library's primary clientele will be maintained.

- To be most successful, leaders in the consolidation planning must think outside the boxes of their respective former institutions.
- Communication is key! Jump right in. Begin conversations. Meet and greet. Get to know one another better.
- Expect, acknowledge, and address the inevitable emotional stages of the grief process that will begin as soon as the change process begins. Georgia Health Science University employees, who were just completing transitions related to a prior university restructuring and name change, faced more change with the consolidation. Augusta State University changed from a community/regional university to a university seeking highest-level research designation. Change generally produces a series of emotional reactions leading to acceptance and engagement. GRU Human Resources addressed this process with multiple presentations of “Making the Most of Change: Leading Campus Transitions” for employees, helping employees to gain an understanding of the emotional progression.
- Stay in touch with the libraries’ primary customers who are themselves either heavily involved with and/or affected by the consolidation. Make all decisions regarding service with the libraries’ patrons in mind. Service to the libraries’ clientele is not only a primary *raison d’être* for a library, but service, in particular to students, is a linchpin for SACS affirmation as a new university.
- Thoroughly involve everyone at all levels in giving input, making plans, and suggesting reallocation of resources. Identify important collaborative projects that will benefit both libraries and carefully select faculty and staff members in corresponding affinity areas in both libraries to work on them.
- Make every effort to stick to the timeline. Work closely within the system, processes, and procedures that the two universities’ joint consolidation planning team has put in place. This includes documenting all phases of the process.
- Make sure the libraries maintain close connections with the campus information technology/computer services, human resources, and business operations personnel. Establish formalized liaison relationships where possible.
- Carefully consider the hidden costs of consolidation. Identify one-time funds needed to move physical collections or accomplish renovations. Hidden costs included the administrative burden of managing two separate budgets for six months after the official consolidation date and before the end of the fiscal year. At the same time, a new consolidated budget had to be created factoring in the increased student count of the consolidated university and its impact on collection resources. In the early Spring of 2013, at the time of budget planning for the upcoming budget year commencing July 1 of 2013, many vendors had not provided the information needed on how to proceed with collection renewals; in other words, library management had to plan for the upcoming fiscal year with a flat budget allocation and without knowing vendor cost increases.

A Library Consolidation Work Team met weekly to hammer out every facet of consolidated library operations ranging from centralizing Library Administration, consolidating Library Online Public Access Catalogs (OPACs) and policies, etc. to creating a consolidated organizational chart at a

time when the new Director had not even arrived at the institution. Library Consolidation Work Team members as well as other staff spent thousands of hours examining existing processes at both libraries and creating new consolidated ones. This was sometimes very difficult due to the many differences between an academic library of a liberal arts campus and a health sciences library supporting medical, dental, and allied health colleges. There was significant turnover of faculty and staff during the time of transition between Fall of 2012 and the beginning of fiscal year 2014 on July 1, 2013. Significant progress has been made through the leadership of the new director and the dedicated teamwork of Library Work Team members, but much work remains to be done.

Where do we go from here?

As the GRU libraries move forward, they will need to solidify their place in the overall university's quest to become a top-tier, research level university. Part of this process will entail marketing the Library to its constituents. The GRU Libraries Marketing Committee (GLMC) was formed as a result of consolidation and was tasked with "developing and implementing a formal marketing plan for GRU Libraries that will increase visibility and support of Library services, resources, and initiatives." The GLMC has completed this formal marketing plan, based upon collaboration with the GRU Office of Communication and Marketing, and the plan has been disseminated to library faculty and staff through a LibGuide created by the members of the GLMC (<http://guides.gru.edu/glmc>).

Other efforts to ingrain the Library as part of a research university include: branding the Library, its programs, and services through the consolidated website; promoting the embedded/liaison librarian programs; encouraging collaborative research projects and conference presentations between librarians from both libraries; engaging and supporting library faculty in the research process; and conducting benchmarking studies using our aspirational peers in order to identify best practices and to compare funding, collections, and staffing.

Jeff Heck (jheck@gru.edu) is Interim Director of the Reese Library at Georgia Regents University. **Kathy J. Davies** (kadavies@gru.edu) is Chair, Research and Education Services of the Greenblatt Library at Georgia Regents University. **Fay L. Verburg** (fverburg@gru.edu) is Chair, Research and Education Services of the Reese Library at Georgia Regents University. **Marianne Brown** (marbrown@gru.edu) is Business Manager for the University Libraries at Georgia Regents University. **Virginia L. Loveless** (vloveless@gru.edu) is Project Manager at the Reese Library at Georgia Regents University. **Sandra L. Bandy** (sbandy@gru.edu) is Chair, Content Management at the Greenblatt Library at Georgia Regents University. **Brenda L. Seago** (bseago@gru.edu) is Director, University Libraries at Georgia Regents University.

Endnotes

- ¹. Grant Harman and Kay Harman, "Institutional Mergers In Higher Education: Lessons From International Experience," *Tertiary Education and Management* 9, no. 1 (2003): 29-44.
- ². Harman, "Institutional Mergers," 32.
- ³. Alireza Ahmadvand, Kazem Heidari, S. Hamed Hosseini, and Reza Majdzadeh, "Challenges and Success Factors in University Mergers and Academic Integrations," *Archives of Iranian Medicine* 15, no. 12 (2012): 736-740.
- ⁴. Adriaan Swanepoel, "Lessons Learned From Library Mergers at Colleges of Higher Education in Flanders," *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science* 71, no. 1 (2005): 85-92.
- ⁵. William Locke, "Higher Education Mergers: Integrating Organisational Cultures and Developing Appropriate Management Styles," *Higher Education Quarterly* 61, no. 1 (2007): 83-102.
- ⁶. Ronald A. McGinnis, William McMillen, and Jeffrey P. Gold, "Merging Two Universities: The Medical University of Ohio and the University of Toledo," *Academic Medicine* 82, no. 12 (2007): 1187-1195.
- ⁷. M. Roy Wilson and Richard D. Krugman, "The Changing Face of Academic Health Centers: A Path Forward for the University of Colorado Denver," *Academic Medicine* 83, no. 9 (2008): 855-860.
- ⁸. Christina Flemming, "A Joint University Library: Vision and Reality," *Library Management* 33, no. 1/2 (2012): 95-103.
- ⁹. Ibid., 97.
- ¹⁰. Hong-Wei Huang (Translated by Sha Li Zhang), "College and University Mergers: Impact on Academic Libraries in China," *College & Research Libraries* 61, no. 2 (2000): 121-125.
- ¹¹. Huang, "College and University Mergers," 124.
- ¹². Ibid., 124-125.

Submitted: March 2013

Accepted with Revisions: April 2013

Published: November 2013

Appendix 1

Condensed List of Work Teams

Academic Affairs, Academic Programs, Academic Student Success, Accreditation/Prospectus, Administrative Services, Advancement and Development, Alumni Affairs, AP & Travel, Athletics, Audit and Compliance & Risk Management, Auxiliary Services, Branding, Budgets, Bursar & Receivables, Campus Card – ID Badging, Ceremonies, Commencement 2013, Communications, Community Teaching & Meeting Spaces, Continuing Education, Enrollment, Facilities, Faculty Affairs, Faculty Credentialing, Faculty Governance, Finance, Government Affairs, Graduate Studies, Human Resources, Inclusion and Diversity, Information Technology, Institutional Effectiveness, Institutional Research, International Programs, Legal, Libraries, Nursing, Payroll, Promotion & Tenure, PS Financials, Public Safety/Security, Research Administration, Strategic Planning, Student Affairs, Student Government, Supply Chain, Tuition & Fees, and Unit Planning & Assessment.