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CHAPTER 12
When Libraries Combine: Creating a Georgia Regents University Libraries Website

Virginia Feher and Kim Mears

SUCCESSFUL ACADEMIC LIBRARY website design is crucial for providing convenient, effortless, and rapid discovery of information and scholarly resources. The design of a webpage along with the clarity of the terminology affects how various elements are discovered as well as perceived, determining if users are able to easily find the information they need when quickly scanning a webpage. Successful design requires not only choosing the correct elements to include but also combining them skillfully so that the visuals support, rather than impede, information delivery. In addition, a well-organized website provides clear pathways to information. Because of the abundance of services and information academic libraries offer, library websites have the potential for offering too much information, looking cluttered, and confusing the user. Nielsen (2000) argued that “people are extremely goal-driven on the Web. They have something specific they want to do, and they don’t tolerate anything standing between them and their goal” (p. 380), while Holtze (2006) pointed out that “web designers in libraries face a particularly difficult challenge: selecting only a few salient pieces of information to highlight since each patron’s desired outcome differs” (p. 96).
When two universities with disparate user populations consolidate, the challenges of combining their respective library's websites into a cohesive and effective website can increase exponentially, especially when employees face increased workloads and time constraints related to consolidation. Reconciling the differences requires teamwork and the willingness to compromise. Because each library may place emphasis on different resources or services, it is equally challenging to reconcile similarities, such as a shared online catalog or a database aggregator. One library may heavily promote a shared resource while the other prefers to keep it less visible. Combining two very different library websites requires detailed planning and implementation so that the final product fulfills each library's purpose and retains its unique identity while communicating a unified presence. This chapter outlines the challenges and the opportunities that library employees encountered while combining the Reese and Greenblatt Library websites into a unified web presence: the Georgia Regents University Libraries website.

Background
In January 2012, the University System of Georgia (USG) announced consolidation plans for eight of its thirty-five institutions. In a news release announcing the consolidations, Hank Huskaby, chancellor of the USG Board of Regents, explained that the benefits of consolidation would include "increased administrative efficiencies and greater economies of scale through the creation of larger institutions" (USG, 2012). Consolidating universities was viewed as a cost-saving measure for the USG with the goal of a "more educated Georgia" (USG, 2012).

As part of this cost-saving plan, two institutions located less than three miles apart—Augusta State University (ASU) and Georgia Health Sciences University (GHSU)—were designated by the USG Board of Regents for consolidation. Though closest in physical proximity of the institutions chosen for consolidation, they could be considered the farthest apart with regards to institutional mission and student populations. An access institution with a focus on the liberal arts, ASU served a mainly undergraduate population of approximately 7,000 students and employed 250 faculty. (An access institution provides learning support and other services for students who might otherwise not attend college because of admissions or financial challenges.) GHSU offered professional degrees in the health sciences to 2,500 students and employed 950 faculty (Heck et al., 2013). On January 8, 2013, the Board of Regents officially approved the consolidation of ASU and GHSU, and the combined institutions became Georgia Regents University (GRU), a comprehensive research university with a focus on the health sciences.

Between January 2012 and January 2013, work groups, teams, and sub-teams consisting of employees across the campuses participated in consolidating the two universities. The ASU-GHSU Consolidation Working Group consisted of representatives from both campuses as well as the Augusta community and acted as an oversight committee, guiding the consolidation process. The Consolidation Action Team, consisting of key leaders from each institution, governed day-to-day consolidation activities. In addition, multiple teams and sub-teams across both campuses worked on reconciling policies and procedures, such as promotion and tenure, faculty governance, and human resources (Augusta State University & Georgia Health Sciences University, n.d.).

In the new organizational structure, ASU Reese Library and GHSU Robert B. Greenblatt, M.D. Library became GRU Libraries. While each library provides access to resources for undergraduate and graduate students, faculty, researchers, staff, and community users, the libraries differ in their target user groups. Reese Library serves a broader user group within multiple disciplines, mainly undergraduates, while Greenblatt Library serves a health professional community and the GRU Health System. The Library Work Team (LWT), with members from both Reese and Greenblatt, guided the libraries through the process of reconciling the differences to combine the two libraries into one administrative unit. The LWT was also responsible for overseeing and approving the work of sub-teams as well as for ensuring the libraries' continued compliance with selected Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACS-COC) accreditation standards. In "Consolidation: A Tale of Two Libraries," Heck et al. (2013) offer an overview of the libraries' consolidation, describing the sub-teams' charges and accomplishments, including a brief summary of the Libraries' Consolidated Website Sub-team (CLWS), which was formed in June 2012 and "tasked with designing and implementing a new consolidated website for the University Libraries" (p. 7).
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Planning for a Consolidated Libraries Website

The CLWS consisted of librarians and staff from Greenblatt and Yankee libraries, with five members at the outset. Greenblatt Library members included the virtual services librarian, an access services staff member who transitioned to the nursing information librarian faculty position while serving on the sub-team, and the clinical information librarian. Reese Library members included the user engagement librarian and a library systems staff member. In October 2012, the newly hired Reese Library government information librarian joined the CLWS. This addition resulted in equal representation from the two libraries.

The CLWS members recognized the challenge of making a cohesive website given the numerous differences between the two libraries’ user populations and website needs. For example, while both libraries utilize Voyager, the statewide integrated library system, they direct users to different versions of the online public access catalog (OPAC), called GIL and GIL-Find. The Reese Library academic community primarily uses GALILEO, the statewide database interface that provides a web scale discovery tool, offering users a “single search box providing a Google-like experience” (Vaughan, 2011, p. 7). The Greenblatt Library website provided the most popular databases in a quick links menu on the homepage and a webpage with an alphabetical list of resources, linking users to subject-specific databases. To find solutions for reconciling these differences, the CLWS members established a process that included gathering website design literature, creating and distributing a survey to Reese and Greenblatt library users, reviewing peer and aspirational academic and health sciences library websites, and performing a card sort exercise on both campuses. The Greenblatt Library director requested that they gather information derived from the end-user perspective in order to make data-driven decisions. This approach greatly assisted in facilitating compromise as the sub-team members had divergent and strong viewpoints based on individual experiences.

In searching the literature, the CLWS members found several useful books on website design for libraries. In a guide produced by the Library and Information Technology Association, Lehman and Nikkel (2008) reviewed the complete process for curating a user-friendly web presence. The types of usability assessments and their real-world applications are covered as well as techniques for documenting and communicating the results. Da-
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With approval from the GHSU Division of Institutional Effectiveness, the CLWS members created and distributed separate surveys to Reese and Greenblatt library users. The surveys included similar questions but were customized based on campus differences. For example, Greenblatt Library offered a customized database list on the library’s website while Reese Library directed patrons to the statewide database system GALILEO. In addition, the Greenblatt Library’s survey included the user category “clinical” while the Reese Library’s survey included “community user” to better reflect
each library's user populations. The purpose of the surveys was to determine users' opinions of and experiences with the current websites as well as to discover what features, content, or improvements users desired. According to Robbins, Esposito, Kretz, and Aloi (2007), "soliciting user feedback in the form of surveys, focus groups, and task-based analysis has proven a valuable method of ensuring that any redesign will reflect the needs and thought processes of the end user" (p. 4). The surveys were valuable for demonstrating the needs of both user populations. The results showed that Reese Library users always or often go to the library's website to access GALEO databases (always, 26%; often, 37%), GIL-Find (always, 21%; often, 34%), and the electronic journal locator (always, 15%; often, 30%). The results also showed that Greenblatt users always or often go to the library's website to access specific databases (always, 44%; often, 41%) and the ejournal navigator (always, 29%; often, 45%). Additionally, Greenblatt users rarely (22%) or never (38%) access GIL from the website. Notably, many of the survey participant's comments indicated a pressing need to redesign both websites.

To identify trends and useful features, the CLWS members looked at existing library websites that represented both an academic library and a medical or health sciences library, including the University of Kentucky Libraries and the University at Buffalo Libraries. The committee also reviewed the library websites of university peer and aspirational institutions, such as the University of Alabama, Birmingham. Trends that emerged included a horizontal navigation menu with drop-down links, a prominent tabbed search box for searching databases and/or the online catalog, and a social media dashboard. Another trend that the committee identified was a main page, or portal, for institutions with more than one library, which serves as a gateway to the different library homepages. The CLWS members agreed that the portal approach could serve as a unifying presence, both functionally and symbolically, as the consolidated homepage would not just provide library users with a central point of access but also would provide a virtual collaborative space for the two libraries. Additionally, the page would provide pathways to information about both libraries and also direct users to each library's unique website.

The CLWS members decided that applying a horizontal navigation menu on the libraries' webpages—encompassing the portal page, Reese Library website, and Greenblatt Library website—would serve as a unifying element while still allowing each library to retain its own web identity on its homepage with unique design and content. To gather user data that would assist them in choosing categories and links for the horizontal navigation bar, the CLWS members performed a card sort exercise on both campuses. A card sort exercise is one method for determining users' expectations with regards to both the structure of a webpage and its terminology (Kitalong, Hoepner, & Scharf, 2008; McHale, 2008; Robbins et al., 2007; Whang, 2008). Card sorts use index cards in addition to writing implements and are not automated; they can be open or closed. Some studies described an open card sort in which participants were provided with predetermined terms on index cards that they were asked to organize into logical groupings, and then choose a category heading name for each grouping (Kitalong et al., 2008; McHale, 2008; Robbins et al., 2007). Whang (2008), however, described an open card sort in which the participants were provided with blank index cards and told to choose their own terms as well as category headings. McHale (2008) described a closed card sort in which participants were provided with the category headings and asked to group the cards with predetermined terms under the headings. Nielsen (2004) recommended using 15 participants for a card sort exercise because this results in a 0.90 correlation, providing optimal information, while using more than 15 participants results in "diminishing returns" (para. 9).

The CLWS members chose to perform a closed card sort, asking participants to organize index cards that had a resource or service name already provided into groups under a predetermined category heading. At the end of the sorting exercise, the card sort moderator asked the participants to suggest alternate names and categories and asked a series of follow-up questions, including how they would order the cards in a list, such as alphabetically or by importance. The CLWS members hoped that the card sort exercise data would further assist in reconciling the differences between the disparate user groups—health professionals and a mainly liberal arts commuter community—and identify services and resources appropriate for both user groups. Data from the card sort, however, was difficult to analyze and apply given that subjects tended to group unrelated items under the same heading, seemingly forcing items into disparate groupings. Brucker (2010) contended that with a closed card sort "there is a real danger of skewing the results, guiding users into categories that might not actually make any sense to them, or categories they never would have created on their own" (p. 43). Despite these difficulties, the card sort
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was useful in identifying confusing terms and also provided rich qualitative data from the participants' comments and suggestions. Based on the survey results, the card sort activities, and meeting discussions, the CLWS members developed a draft mockup of the consolidated libraries homepage. The members agreed that the following features should be present on the mock-up: a prominent search box, a live chat box, links to individual library websites, a horizontal navigation menu, an RSS blog feed, and social media links. Several meetings were dedicated to determining which categories and drop-down links to include in the navigation menu. The CLWS members wanted to ensure that the information provided would be applicable to both user groups without overloading the drop-down menus. Accomplishing this goal was a challenge given that library technologies were not fully integrated, including electronic journal locators and OPACs. The CLWS members resolved differences in terminology by providing separate links in a tabbed search box on the portal page with vocabulary based on campus vernacular or library name—Health Sciences Campus for "Greenblatt Library and Summerville Campus for Reese Library. Although these decisions strayed from the CLWS's original vision for the consolidated libraries homepage, providing separate access points was necessary to maintain easy access to resources and meet specific population needs.

In late November 2012, the CLWS members agreed on the structure and content for the horizontal navigation menu and distributed a draft of the menu to all library employees, asking them for comments and suggestions. Once the CLWS members finalized the navigation menu (Figure 12.1), they completed the consolidated homepage mockup (Figure 12.2) and reported their findings to the LWT in early December 2012. The LWT recommended multiple changes to the order and content of the drop-down menus and shared several concerns about the mockup, ultimately requiring major revisions to the design.
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**FIGURE 12.1**
Navigation Menu Proposed to Library Work Team

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Find Resources</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Get Help</th>
<th>Libraries &amp; Collections</th>
<th>About Us</th>
<th>Contact Us</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalog (GLI)</td>
<td>For Students</td>
<td>A-Z Index</td>
<td>Greenblatt Library (Health Sciences)</td>
<td>Floor Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eBooks</td>
<td>For Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>Ask Us!</td>
<td>Reese Library (Summerville)</td>
<td>Give to the Libraries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eJournals</td>
<td>For Clinicians</td>
<td>Liaison/Subject Librarians</td>
<td>Curriculum Center</td>
<td>Maps &amp; Directions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALILEO Databases</td>
<td>For Community Patrons</td>
<td>LibGuides</td>
<td>Government Information</td>
<td>Organizational Chart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences Databases</td>
<td>For Patrons with Disabilities</td>
<td>Off-Campus Access</td>
<td>Historical Collections (Greenblatt)</td>
<td>Policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Resources</td>
<td>Borrowing &amp; Renewal</td>
<td>Research Consultation</td>
<td>Special Collections (Reese)</td>
<td>Staff Directory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL Express Tutorials</td>
<td>Strategic Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary Loan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 12.2**
Mockup Proposed to Library Work Team
Implementing a Consolidated Libraries Website

In late December 2012, the LWT disbanded the CLWS and assigned the responsibility of implementing the combined web presence to a team of two librarians: Virginia Feher, a government information librarian at Reese Library, and Kim Mears, a nursing information librarian at Greenblatt Library (the authors). This team structure ensured representation from both libraries and removed the task of website consolidation from a committee environment, thus accelerating planning and implementation. We effectively streamlined the project and developed a revised graphical mockup of the consolidated homepage that addressed the concerns of the LWT. This mockup was based on a template that the Office of Communications & Marketing (OCM) developed, which was not yet approved or available for editing in the content management system (CMS). Because we did not have access to the CMS on the GRU staging server at the time of official consolidation in January 2013, we proactively contacted the OCM for assistance with presenting a unified library web presence and asked for a rudimentary landing page that would link to the existing ASU and GHSU library websites. In hindsight, a simple "under construction" page with links to the respective library's homepages would have been a better solution as the library did not have the permissions to edit the temporary page, necessitating multiple requests for changes and corrections to the content.

At a meeting with the OCM in mid-June 2013, we learned that the Reese and Greenblatt websites had to be migrated to a new server to meet an early July SACS-COC deadline. By this time, the libraries had gained access to the template in the CMS and could create webpages. However, the CMS provided only one template with limited flexibility in design, including the inability to offer a horizontal navigation menu—the key feature that both the CLWS and us worked diligently on developing. The priority was then shifted to meeting SACS-COC deadlines, even with pages that did not meet the sub-team's design and usability expectations. Since the Greenblatt Library website existed within the same CMS environment, the Greenblatt Library's pages were successfully transferred with minor updates. The Reese Library's pages had to be reconstructed due to compatibility issues, resulting in quick decisions regarding organization and content with little input from Reese Library staff. Fortuitously, much of the Reese site linked to content on outside servers, such as LibGuides, GALILEO, and the OPAC, reducing the number of pages that we had to reconstruct, and thus decreasing the time spent on completing the task.

We had reservations about the design and restrictions of the university template and believed that it would interfere with our goal of a robust and visually pleasing libraries website. Peterson (2006) stated that "the library Web site is unique due to the wide range of services and content available" (p. 217). We wanted a unique consolidated homepage that would look professional and polished and not have the look of a secondary page. Connell (2013) found common themes when reviewing case study articles about libraries that implemented an institutional CMS for their website, including "the issue of lack of control and problems of collaboration between academic libraries and the campus entities controlling website management" (p. 44). We faced similar circumstances, so we met with the director of libraries to discuss options.

Because the university template offered little flexibility in design, including the lack of a horizontal navigation menu, we and director of libraries decided to pursue other avenues to create a libraries website that met our needs. With support from the vice provost, we worked with an outside contractor to design and implement the consolidated libraries homepage. We provided the revised mockup to the contractor, who created a draft page that retained the elements but provided an alternative design. After several revisions with refinements to the design and content, the page was approved by us and LWT. We then faced a significant challenge due to an extremely brief timeline set by university administration to go live with the consolidated homepage. Several of the secondary pages for the links in the navigation menu had not yet been created and the tabbed search box was missing content. Though not ideal, we opted to launch the page in phases, with the navigation menu removed for the first launch. This decision expedited the timeline, and the libraries finally had a unique consolidated homepage on July 29, 2013. With subsequent phases, we reinserted an updated navigation menu (Figure 12.3) with links to newly created pages that (mainly) represented both libraries and added an OPAC search feature in the tabbed search box. Even with the consolidation of the OPACs and GALILEO databases, the two campuses are still divergent in how they access resources. For example, the Summerville Campus remains wedded to GALILEO and its discovery tool, while the Health Sciences Campus uses an alphabetical linked list of resources.
Implementing a Consolidated Libraries Website

In late December 2012, the JLT disbanded the CLWS and assigned the responsibility of implementing the combined web presence to a team of two librarians: Virginia Feher, a government information librarian at Reese Library, and Kim Mears, a nursing information librarian at Greenblatt Library (the authors). This team structure ensured representation from both libraries and removed the task of website consolidation from a committee environment, thus accelerating planning and implementation. We effectively streamlined the project and developed a revised graphical mockup of the consolidated homepage that addressed the concerns of the JLT. This mockup was based on a template that the Office of Communications & Marketing (OCM) developed, which was not yet approved or available for editing in the content management system (CMS). Because we did not have access to the CMS on the GRU staging server at the time of official consolidation in January 2013, we proactively contacted the OCM for assistance with presenting a unified library web presence and asked for a rudimentary landing page that would link to the existing ASU and GHSU library websites. In hindsight, a simple “under construction” page with links to the respective library’s homepages would have been a better solution as the library did not have the permissions to edit the temporary page, necessitating multiple requests for changes and corrections to the content.

At a meeting with the OCM in mid-June 2013, we learned that the Reese and Greenblatt websites had to be migrated to a new server to meet an early July SACS-COC deadline. By this time, the libraries had gained access to the template in the CMS and could create webpages. However, the CMS provided only one template with limited flexibility in design, including the inability to offer a horizontal navigation menu—the key feature that both the CLWS and us worked diligently on developing. The priority was then shifted to meeting SACS-COC deadlines, even with pages that did not meet the sub-team’s design and usability expectations. Since the Greenblatt Library website existed within the same CMS environment, the Greenblatt Library’s pages were successfully transferred with minor updates. The Reese Library’s pages had to be reconstructed due to compatibility issues, resulting in quick decisions regarding organization and content with little input from Reese Library staff. Fortuitously, much of the Reese site linked to content on outside servers, such as LibGuides, GALILEO, and the OPAC, reducing the number of pages that we had to reconstruct, and thus decreasing the time spent on completing the task.

We had reservations about the design and restrictions of the university template and believed that it would interfere with our goal of a robust and visually pleasing libraries website. Peterson (2006) stated that “the library Web site is unique due to the wide range of services and content available” (p. 217). We wanted a unique consolidated homepage that would look professional and polished and not have the look of a secondary page. Connell (2013) found common themes when reviewing case study articles about libraries that implemented an institutional CMS for their website, including “the issue of lack of control and problems of collaboration between academic libraries and the campus entities controlling website management” (p. 44). We faced similar circumstances, so we met with the director of libraries to discuss options.

Because the university template offered little flexibility in design, including the lack of a horizontal navigation menu, we and director of libraries decided to pursue other avenues to create a libraries website that met our needs. With support from the vice provost, we worked with an outside contractor to design and implement the consolidated libraries homepage. We provided the revised mockup to the contractor, who created a draft page that retained the elements but provided an alternative design. After several revisions with refinements to the design and content, the page was approved by us and JLT. We then faced a significant challenge due to an extremely brief timeline set by university administration to go live with the consolidated homepage. Several of the secondary pages for the links in the navigation menu had not yet been created and the tabbed search box was missing content. Though not ideal, we opted to launch the page in phases, with the navigation menu removed for the first launch. This decision expedited the timeline, and the libraries finally had a unique consolidated homepage on July 29, 2013. With subsequent phases, we reinsered an updated navigation menu (Figure 12.3) with links to newly created pages that (mainly) represented both libraries and added an OPAC search feature in the tabbed search box. Even with the consolidation of the OPACs and GALILEO databases, the two campuses are still divergent in how they access resources. For example, the Summerville Campus remains wedded to GALILEO and its discovery tool, while the Health Sciences Campus uses an alphabetical linked list of resources.
To retain local control and update information quickly, we decided to maintain the Greenblatt and Reese Library websites within the CMS environment and forego the navigation menu as a unifying element across the websites. The consolidated homepage (Figure 12.4) remains the only page with the horizontal navigation menu. Library staff edit the page outside of the CMS, and the OCM staff upload revised files as library staff do not have server access. Though not ideal, we considered it a necessary compromise so that the libraries could provide a unique portal page that positively represents the combined libraries but also ensures that we could easily maintain the Reese and Greenblatt websites.

During the project, the GRU director of libraries asked us to propose a slogan representing the libraries' vision that they could feature on the consolidated homepage. This request provided the opportunity for us to solicit feedback from staff in both libraries, encouraging consensus building. We compiled a list of possible slogans and then distributed a survey to all library employees, asking them to choose or nominate a slogan. The winning slogan "Connect, Discover, Collaborate" was approved by the director of libraries and is now featured prominently on the consolidated homepage. The slogan is also available for use on libraries' promotional materials, such as flyers and posters.

Conclusion

The website project occurred within a fast-paced environment in which staff across both campuses were responsible for many tasks related to consolidation in addition to their day-to-day responsibilities. This, among other factors, made the process of developing a consolidated web presence a challenge. Leading up to and immediately after consolidation, library staff did not have access to the staging server within the CMS, meaning that they had to wait for OCM staff to provide access and also rely on them to create and update the temporary consolidated homepage. The OCM was focused on launching the main GRU webpages, resulting in delays for
To retain local control and update information quickly, we decided to maintain the Greenblatt and Reese Library websites within the CMS environment and forego the navigation menu as a unifying element across the websites. The consolidated homepage (Figure 12.4) remains the only page with the horizontal navigation menu. Library staff edit the page outside of the CMS, and the OCM staff upload revised files as library staff do not have server access. Though not ideal, we considered it a necessary compromise so that the libraries could provide a unique portal page that positively represents the combined libraries but also ensures that we could easily maintain the Reese and Greenblatt websites.
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### FIGURE 12.3
Final Navigation Menu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Get Help</th>
<th>Libraries &amp; Collections</th>
<th>About Us</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases A-Z</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Ask Us!</td>
<td>Greenblatt Library</td>
<td>Maps &amp; Directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>Liaison/Subject</td>
<td>Reese Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>(Summerville)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eBooks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clinicians &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog (Go-Gan)</td>
<td>Community Users</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Off-Campus Access</td>
<td>Historical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Collections &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Archives (Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sciences)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GALILEO</td>
<td>Research</td>
<td>Special Collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>(Summerville)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scholarly Commons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FIGURE 12.4
Final Consolidated Libraries’ Homepage

**Conclusion**

The website project occurred within a fast-paced environment in which staff across both campuses were responsible for many tasks related to consolidation in addition to their day-to-day responsibilities. This, among other factors, made the process of developing a consolidated web presence a challenge. Leading up to and immediately after consolidation, library staff did not have access to the staging server within the CMS, meaning that they had to wait for OCM staff to provide access and also rely on them to create and update the temporary consolidated homepage. The OCM was focused on launching the main GRU webpages, resulting in delays for
the libraries. Despite gaining access to the CMS, compulsory SACS-COC accreditation deadlines forced us to focus on completing tasks (quantity) within time constraints rather than focusing on quality. We had to alter planned features, such as the navigation menu, and we also could not include the chat box since both libraries had not yet implemented the service. Further complications resulted from delays in the consolidation of information technology systems across both campuses, which necessitated that the libraries maintain different authentication methods for accessing subscribed resources off-campus. Greenblatt Library used a single sign-on method and Reese Library used a common university password that was changed and redistributed at the beginning of each semester. Libraries information technology staff implemented a work-around so that both campuses could use a single sign-on method, but since the Health Sciences Campus does not utilize the discovery tool, we have not added the search box. Thus the consolidated homepage search box still includes different links for Greenblatt and Reese patrons, which emphasizes the campus differences.

Though challenging, the project had many positive results. It afforded us the opportunity to develop professional relationships with the OCM staff, which will facilitate future collaboration on website projects to benefit library users, such as a robust A-Z databases page (currently a static HTML page that is difficult to maintain). Collaborating with the OCM also made it easier to request additional links to the GRU Libraries’ homepage on university webpages, increasing the libraries’ visibility to the campus community. In addition to links featured on the GRU Academics and Students homepages, a Libraries link is available in the footer of the majority of the university's webpages. Most importantly, the project resulted in unification of the libraries’ web presence and fostered consensus building between the two libraries.

More than a year after official consolidation, the intensity of efforts has waned. However, websites require continuous maintenance and revisions, and libraries’ administration has requested an expansion of our web team to ensure representation from departments across both libraries. Thus, the web team has expanded into a Libraries Web Group (LWG). The group is charged with working on short- and long-term projects with tangible results. In the short-term, the LWG implemented mobile sites for the consolidated homepage and the Reese Library homepage and redesigned an existing Greenblatt mobile site (for consistency in design). The LWG also implemented a redesigned Reese Library homepage and a redesigned Greenblatt Library homepage. Future long-term projects include a dynamic A-Z database page and additional webpages that link to resources for specific subject areas. These ongoing projects are aimed at providing a robust GRU Libraries web presence while still providing direct access to customized resources for both user populations.
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Chapter 13
Hidden from View: The Role of Organizational Culture in Collegiate Restructuring

Lynn N. Baird

ADMINISTRATORS IN HIGHER education are frequently challenged to seek synergies, achieve efficiencies, and deliver effective educational experiences in an environment of declining resources. Presidents and provosts continually seek that spot where engaged student learning occurs at a reasonable cost. The academic library often becomes an area of interest for administrators because of high operating costs, perceived waning use by patrons, and the absence or ineffective use of standardized metrics to communicate contributions to the education and research missions of the institution. Library administrators may find their provost and decanal colleagues lack an appreciation for the managerial and communal processes that define librarianship. In environments where respect for this special disciplinary knowledge is lacking, library leaders may find their libraries vulnerable to external pressure to restructure and reshape their programs.

One strategy to reduce costs is to streamline operations to achieve efficiencies with fewer staff. This chapter examines how one institution launched a merger of the library and its information technology unit with a vision of finding efficiencies and building synergies. This case study will be useful to library administrators, higher education administrators, and oth-
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