

August 4, 2010

### Learning Organization

Abdullah, K. A. S., & Kassim, N. A. (2008). Perceptions of organizational learning practices among Yemeni university librarians. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 13(1), 77-90.

The authors use a tool developed by Watkins and Marsick (1993) to determine the perceptions of the level of organizational learning among university librarians.

Argyris, C., & Schon, D. (1978). *Organization Learning: A theory of action perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Detailed analysis of the difficulties of maintaining a learning organization, mainly focusing on how correcting errors is a personal and sensitive task. OL occurs “when members of the organization act as learning agents for the organization, responding to changes in the internal and external environments of the organization by detecting and correcting errors ...” 29

Baets, W. R. (2006). *Complexity, Learning and Organizations: A quantum interpretation of business*. London; New York: Routledge.

Baets presents a more philosophical approach; nice section on individual goals; another on whether or not institutions learn.

Belasen, A. T. (2000). *Leading the Learning Organization: Communication and competencies for managing change*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Belasen focuses on the role of leaders in establishing a climate conducive to learning through temporizing structural arrangements, delayering chain of command, creating boundary-less structures, forming empowered teams staffed by cross-trained individuals, using more flexible and informal forms of coordination, enhancing organizational and individual communication capabilities, focusing on customer needs, implementing quality improvement, reengineering work processes, investing in information technology, and establishing partnerships with suppliers. “The argument advanced is that horizontal organizations, on the other hand, require leadership by

August 4, 2010

virtue of their decentralized structures, or as in the case of delayed organizations staff with self-managed teams, due to the absence of supervisory relationships. Empowered team members think and act like local entrepreneurs who are sensitive to customer demands and can respond quickly and creatively to market changes” (3).

Baughman, S. & Hubbard, B. A. (2001). *Becoming a learning organization* (University of Maryland Libraries working paper #3). Retrieved from

[http://www.lib.umd.edu/PUB/working\\_paper\\_3.html](http://www.lib.umd.edu/PUB/working_paper_3.html)

Efforts of University of Maryland to become a LO: definition, assessment, and initial content areas for the learning and education program. Definition from Senge (personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, team learning, and systems thinking). Key Principles: focus on customer, commitment to quality, teamwork and partnerships, incorporation of best practices and continuous improvement, continuous learning and education, and continuous change when it leads to improvement.

5 modules: Development of Organization (workshops); Development of Self and Team (provide tools and knowledge to support staff); Exploring Leadership and Followership (ways to behave – leader versus boss); Defining Customer Service (philosophy of customer service and attributes of library customers, implement teams, problem solving); Self-Awareness and Improvement (workshops). Also provides a specific outline of future activities.

-- & Kaske, N. (2002). Impact of organizational learning. *Portal*, 2(4), 665-9. doi:10.1353/pla.2002.0070

Berk, M. (2009). *Organization Learning and Learning Organization* (Parts 1-4). Retrieved from

<http://www.thefreelibrary.com/Organization+Learning+and+Learning+Organization+Part+1-a01073946213>

Block, M. (2003). *Net Effects: How Librarians Can Manage the Unintended Consequences of the Internet*. Medford, N.J.: Information Today.

August 4, 2010

Brandt, R. (2003). Is this school a learning organization? 10 ways to tell. Retrieved from

<http://www.nsd.org/news/getDocument.cfm?articleID=269>

Learning organizations have an incentive structure that encourages adaptive behavior; have challenging but achievable shared goals; have members who can accurately identify the organization's stages of development

1. Learning organizations gather, process, and act upon information in ways best suited to their purposes.
2. Learning organizations have an institutional knowledge base and processes for creating new ideas
3. Learning organizations exchange information frequently with relevant external sources
4. Learning organizations get feedback on products and services
5. Learning organizations continuously refine their basic processes
6. Learning organization have supportive organizational cultures
7. Learning organizations are 'open systems' sensitive to the external environment, including social, political, and economic conditions

Brown, P. (2006). Committee Home SDC Learning Organization Notes, Committee on the Learning Organization. Retrieved from

<http://wiki.library.vanderbilt.edu/committees/pmwiki.php/SDC/LearningOrganizationNotes>

How to implement a learning organization? What are some of the most effective ways for these skills to be taught? Please recommend resources (print, electronic, workshops, conferences, etc.) and key people. *Summary of the Discussion and Answer:* by opening up discussion groups to share ideas and challenge current ways of thinking and mental models. We may want to invite experts on specific topics for Brown Bag forums on specific topics.

What are the best two ways to begin this process? *Summary of the Discussion and Answer:* review readings (either full texts or excerpts\_ from Peter Senge's The Fifth Discipline

August 4, 2010

and the Fifth Discipline Field book (Pam brought a chapter to share from the latter title). We can take the 5 disciplines; create journal or discussion groups on each topic.

What don't we know that we don't know enough to ask? *Summary of the Discussion and Answer*: becoming a Learning Organization is not prescriptive. It's not something that has defined steps of # 1 to #10 and voila, you are a Learning Organization. It is a complex process and perhaps better than having the goal of becoming a Learning Organization as a destination, we should just say we want progress in this direction. That any and all progress is good and that is the goal. Not arriving at some end stop place. This is an ongoing process that will never end as we grow and learn as an organization.

Judy Combs of Vanderbilt created Library web labs list new and experimental services offered by the library—usually though not necessarily web-based—and offer ways for patrons to try them and, more importantly, offer feedback.

Conner, M. L. (2004-2007). How's your Learning Culture? Assessment Tool.

<http://agelesslearner.com/assess/cultureaudit.html>

Cook, D. S., & Steward, J. (1997). *The Learning Organization in the Public Services*. Aldershot, Hampshire, England; Brookfield, VT: Gower.

Edwards, P. (2010). Theories-in-use and reflection-in-action: Core principles for LIS education. *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 51(1), 18-29. Retrieved from <http://jelis.org/table-of-contents/volume-51-number-1/>

Fabbi, J., Watson, S., & Marks, K. (2005). UNLV Libraries and the digital identification frontier. *Library Hi Tech*, 23(3), 313-22. Retrieved from doi:10.1108/07378830510621739

Fowler, Rena K. The University Library as Learning Organization for Innovation: An Exploratory Study. 220-232. Retrieved from <http://crl.acrl.org/content/59/3/220.full.pdf>

August 4, 2010

Article outlining University of Nevada Las Vegas Libraries' transformation based on a focus on organizational learning. They began by evaluating the Libraries' Technical Services Division and was conducted with the arrival of a new interim director. Using Arygis and Schon's discussion of single loop and double loop learning, Fabbi began by meeting the technical services department (gathered staff input), organized a call to action (library staff survey with 2 readings for entire staff so they could understand the restructuring), and held a Summit on Discovery (introduced the concept of discovery to the library as a whole) with a mini-conference (knowledge sharing). As a result of this transformation, the library created a discovery task force.

Fowler, R. (1998). The university library as learning organization for innovation: An exploratory study.

*College & Research Libraries*, 59(2), 220-31. Retrieved from <http://crl.acrl.org/content/59/2.toc>

Article documenting measurement at "an innovative university" investigating individual, team, and organizational learning to conclude that there is a relationship between these types of learning and innovation, but the relationship is more complex than predicted. This is basically a call for further research, using the Internet as an outcome variable to measure learning and change. She concludes that "Individual initiative is a necessity, but organizational learning may promote use of the Internet by creating new uses for it, suggesting new roles for librarians through their work with the Internet and institutionalizing the Internet in the workplace. Thus, organizational learning, at every level, may move the group toward innovation." (228). Organizational learning fosters change and adds to the development of the role of the librarian in the technological age.

Frydman, B., Wilson, I., & Wyer, J. (2000). *The power of collaborative leadership: Lessons for the learning organization*. Boston; Oxford; Auckland; Johannesburg; Melbourne; New Delhi: Butterworth Heinemann.

Garvin, D. A. (1993). Building a learning organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 71, 78-91.

August 4, 2010

--. (2000). *Learning in action: A guide to putting the learning organization to work*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Organizations are changing and in need of learning. “A learning organization is an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, interpreting, transferring, and retaining knowledge, and at purposefully modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights” (11).

--, Edmondson, A. C., & Gino, F. (2008). Is yours a learning organization? *Harvard Business Review*. 109–116. [www.hrb.org](http://www.hrb.org)

Definition: “an organization made up of employees skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge. These people could help their firms cultivate tolerance, foster open discussion, and think holistically and systematically” (109). Throughout the article, Garvin, Edmondson, and Gino essentially market a tool businesses can buy to assess whether or not they are learning organizations. Assessments are made in three blocks: supportive learning environment, concrete learning processes and practices, and leadership behavior that reinforces learning.

Geisinger, K., Gutsche, B., Leininger, M., & Fenton, J. (2010). “Power up Your Learning Organization.”

The PLA Blog: The Official Blog of the Public Library Association. Retrieved from <http://plablog.org/2010/03/power-up-your-learning-organization.html>

Obligations of the individual: align learning with organizational vision; accept accountability; engages in learning; shares knowledge. Obligations of the organization: create an organizational vision; set up goals aligned with the vision; create a learning environment that includes learning tools and channels to share knowledge.

Gherardi, S., & Nicolini, D. (2006.) *Organizational knowledge: The texture of workplace learning*. Blackwell Publishing.

Giesecke, J., & McNeil, B. (1989). Core competencies and the learning organization [at the University of Nebraska]. *Library Administration & Management*, 13(3), 158-66.

August 4, 2010

This article focuses on the LO as defined by Garvin and emphasizes the importance of transferring expertise to the organization; “individual learning needs to lead to behavioral changes that clearly improve overall organizational performance ... the results of learning must become part of the organizational culture and processes.”

UNL developed core competencies in 1996, defined as “the knowledge and skills that make the organization a success and help the organization change to meet a changing environment” (158), which are used for “hiring new employees and in the education of current employees.” The competencies were developed by a committee and reviewed by several teams throughout the university. Interview questions were developed based on the competencies, trainings were developed, and the competencies were integrated into the staff evaluations.

--. (2004). Transitioning to the learning organization. *Library Trends*, 53(1), 54-67. Retrieved from <http://www.allbusiness.com/human-resources/careers-job-training/990337-1.html>

Definition: “an organization skilled at creating, acquiring, and transferring knowledge and at modifying its behavior to reflect new knowledge and insights“ (55). Giesecke and McNeil (2004) focus on libraries and suggest the motivation for change includes being able to “adopt strategies that will help the organization move forward and develop proactive responses to change” (55).

They discuss two types of learning: maintenance learning and anticipatory learning. Leaders have three roles in the LO: designers, teachers, and stewards. Giesecke and McNeil create a plan of action using Senge’s five disciplines through the following strategies: committing to change, connect learning with the organization’s operations, assess organizational capacity, communicate the vision of the LO, demonstrate and model a commitment to learning, cut bureaucracy and streamline structure, capture learning and share knowledge, reward learning, learn more about LOs, and continually adapt, improve, and learn.

August 4, 2010

Analyze the University of Nebraska, Lincoln transformation into a LO based on Senge's model. Discuss the vision statement and how they integrated concepts central to an LO, taught the core competencies, encouraging individual learning (personal mastery), developing group learning, developing a new compensation system based on NUValues, and restructuring the library based on a systematic perspective. Surveys conducted thus far indicate that the library has improved.

--. (2009). Update of UNL Learning Organization. Summary of the five LO disciplines with examples of university libraries. Retrieved from <http://www.unl.edu/libr/staffdev/learnorg.shtml>

Gilley, J. W. (2000). *Beyond the Learning Organization: Creating a culture of continuous growth and development through state-of-the-art human resource practices*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.

A learning organization is "an institution that learns powerfully and collectively, continually transforming itself to better manage and use knowledge for corporate success, empowering people within and outside the organization to learn as they work and to utilize technology to maximize learning and production" (14). Good review of other literature in the area from 1990s.

Hayes, J., Sullivan, M., & Baaske, I. (1999). Choosing the road less traveled: The north suburban library system creates a Learning Organization. *Public Libraries*, 38(2), 110-14. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/pla/plapublications/publiclibraries/index.cfm>.

This article outlines north Suburban Library System's implementation of a learning organization beginning in 1994. Located in north Chicago, IL, the libraries involved varied drastically, so the primary goal was flexibility and to be "member-driven." They adopted definitions provided by Senge and Garvin to attain a shared vision by creating "a flatter organizational structure, teamwork, the sharing of information, and the empowering of staff at all levels." Every LO must create its own structure!!!!



August 4, 2010

They began by learning about learning organizations and then brainstorming, taking an assessment to determine where they were on the LO spectrum, the administrative staff did a pilot, implemented a full staff training, hired a LO coach to hold monthly workshops (Maureen Sullivan – Univ of Arizona library and National institutes of health library), created a communications committee, an ongoing committee to evaluate the LO, released an interdepartmental cross training initiative, free monthly all-staff lunches with “silly prizes” for risks taken and “caught you’s” for thanks, new performance appraisal that requires a learning plan. They have documented goals for continuing this improvement in the future. Members have commented on the changes, and they are conducting surveys to get member feedback for the first time. “This model offers a framework for transforming the library organization by tapping the skills, commitment, and creative potential of a broad group of staff members”

Henrich, K. J., & Attebury, R. (2010). Communities of practice at an academic library: A new approach to mentoring at the University of Idaho. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(2). 158-165. doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2010.01.007

Henrich and Attebury discuss the development of a mentoring system at the University of Idaho library in order to mentor new reference librarians. The system is developed on a “shared-learning model, a Community of Practice” (259) that also furthers “the context of the library as a learning organization” because it was found to be more effective for individuals of varying skill and experience levels to learn together as “new technologies induce very dramatic social and cultural change” (158), so the traditional, hierarchical model of mentoring was discarded. CoP exist within a larger organization, and the organization’s attitude towards CoP impacts the development and success of both (162). CoP ties into all 5 of Senge’s disciplines. Managers encouraging an LO can: plan for training and development – but allow employees to direct their learning (like fostering a CoP). The purpose of a CoP is “fostering knowledge creation,

August 4, 2010

information management, and knowledge dissemination in order to increase productivity” (161).

In addition to bringing together librarians from diverse populations a raising “awareness of how current ideas, projects, and research related to each serve the larger organization as a whole,”

CoPs are also tied to “idea creation, innovation, and project success” as well as “job satisfaction” (161).

Barriers: loss of momentum over time, membership departures, loss of attention from members who have numerous other obligations, and localism or isolation of members geographically or departmentally. (162)

Hightower, C., & Soete, G. (1995). The consortium as learning organization: Twelve steps to success in collaborative collections. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 21(2), 87. doi:10.1016/0099-1333(95)90119-1

Pilot collaborative collections management project for California academic libraries. The authors ask if a consortium can behave like a learning organization. The authors acknowledge that their pilot was a noble failure, but encourage future consortiums to learn from their mistakes. Collections are shared primarily because of budget cuts. The collaboration saved the libraries over 100K system-wide in just the first year. They offer twelve tips to collaborating libraries, and argue that collaboration is one way in which libraries can thrive even amidst budget cuts.

Kassim, N. A., & Nor, A. M. (2007). Team learning in a learning organization: The practices of team learning among university librarians in Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Library & Information Science*, 12(1), 55-64.

Analysis of applying the concepts of a LO at an individual level, team level, and organizational level.

Kellesman, M. A., & Watsein, S. B. (2009). Creating opportunities: Embedded librarianship. *Journal of Library Administration*, 49(4), 383-400. doi:10.1080/01930820902832538

August 4, 2010

Killian, D. (2007). The Learning Organization meets the Long Tail (Part 1).

<http://www.clomedia.com/guest-editorial/2007/September/1907/index.php>

It is not easy to create a true learning organization. Developing a shared vision, creating an environment that encourages open communication and empowering individuals are difficult undertakings, given the ever-increasing importance of the knowledge worker.

Kim, Y., & Abbas, J. (2010). Adoption of Library 2.0 Functionalities by Academic Libraries and Users:

A Knowledge Management Perspective. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 36(3), 211-218.

doi:10.1016/j.acalib.2010.03.003

Using the theoretical lens of a community of practice, Kim and Abbas analyze the functionality of library 2.0 and evaluate who is using the web tools. This article highlights the potential of Library 2.0 to increase knowledge sharing within the library as well as with library patrons.

Larsen, K. R., McInerney, C., Nyquist, C., Zogonell dos Santos, A., & Silbee, D. (2002). The Learning

Organizations Homepage. <http://leeds-faculty.colorado.edu/larsenk/learnorg.html>

List of web pages that contribute to the LO theory.

Lavery, C., & Burton, M. (2003). Building a learning culture for the common good. *The Reference*

*Librarian* 83/84, 71-81. Retrieved from

<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t792306953~db=all>

Based at Stauffer Library at Queen's University in Ontario, Canada, Lavery and Burton argue that "librarians are well positioned to embrace the journey towards a learning culture; we have resources and we have incentive!" (71). Furthermore, librarians are on the edge of information technology and committed to change. Additionally, unfortunately, librarians also face an environment with "shrinking human resources. There is more to learn and less time in which to learn in." They describe a "proactive, team-based approach used to create a learning culture in

August 4, 2010

one library.” The specific example they discuss deals with the reference desk and reference questions.

McCusker, E., & Biladeau, S. (May 14, 2009). Idaho Libraries. Libraries = Learning Organizations, presentation. <http://libraries.idaho.gov/page/libraries-learning-organizations>

An organization, characterized by a flat structure and customer-focused teams, that acquires knowledge and innovates fast enough to survive and thrive in a rapidly changing environment. Learning organizations (1) create a culture that encourages and supports continuous employee learning, critical thinking, and risk taking with new ideas, (2) allow mistakes, and value employee contributions, (3) learn from experience and experiment, and (4) disseminate the new knowledge throughout the organization for incorporation into day-to-day activities. In today's world change is constant. In order to survive an organization must be nimble and customer-focused which will allow it to quickly respond to the needs of its customers and the changes in technology.

Marcum, J. (1996). Can the college library become a learning organization? *Advances in Library Administration and Organization*, 14, 39-62.

- article about whether or not a library can become and LO

Nonaka, I. & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The Knowledge Creating Company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of Innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Odasso, P. (2007). The Social Inclusion Function of the School Library. *School Libraries Worldwide*, 13(2), 18-31. Retrieved from

<http://vnweb.hwwilsonweb.com/hww/Journals/getIssues.jhtml?sid=HWW:LIBFT&issn=1023-9391>

This article focuses on the school library and argues that the “school library has the potential to be an essential driver of social inclusion and educational innovation by playing a unique education role in 2 areas: the logical organization of information, which can help to address

August 4, 2010

scholastic dispersion (the drop out problem) and the documentation of professional knowledge to help the school become a learning organization (knowledge management). Odasso suggests that the school library can function as a documentation center for information processed within the school, and the school should document and evaluate this information in order to “incorporate best practices and tacit knowledge” in order to “become a learning organization, and organization that learns from its history, capitalizes on its experiences, self-evaluates, and evaluates the quality of its own educational offerings” (29).

Owens, I. (1999). The impact of change from hierarchy to teams in two academic libraries: intended results versus actual results using total quality management [case study at a southwestern university compared to one at Duke]. *College & Research Libraries*, 60(6), 571-84. Retrieved from <http://crl.acrl.org/content/60/6.toc>

Owens conducted a study at a southwestern university wherein the hierarchy was changed based on the principles of Total Quality Management and then compares the results to a study conducted at Duke University by John Lubans that also underwent change based on TQM. The main change was to move the structure from a hierarchy to a team basis. TQM focuses on examining processes to achieve better service for customers in addition to flattening the organizational structure by encouraging staff to play a larger role in the decision-making process. Another version of this theory is Self Directed work team (SDWT). The changes in the university concluded with staff being more involved, more voice on staff, they were more proactive and creative, more involved with varied duties, and the staff formed partnerships. The study also suggested that the customers benefitted from the change.

Phipps, S. E. (1993). Transforming libraries into learning organizations – the challenge for leadership, *Journal of Library Administration* 18(3-4), 19-37. doi:10.1300/J111v18n03\_03

August 4, 2010

Libraries have the capability of being “empowering institutions, giving people the means to find and use needed information, giving students and faculty the tools to obtain, evaluate, and add to or extend knowledge.” “Senge’s idea of the learning organization is precisely what is needed in today’s transformational academic research library. Learning about and utilizing his five disciplines provide a focus for developing the capabilities of libraries and librarians to develop the library organizations of the future. “ (21)

Systems thinking will help libraries break out of the predictable cycle of problems, change structures and change the way we react to problems (22).

Phipps identifies barriers in academic research libraries as linear thinking (reactive to environmental changes – serial price hikes, computers as tools rather than stretching their potential), controlling leadership (hierarchy), negative mental modes (librarians see themselves as subservient to others rather than necessary collaborators), lack of vision (potential in technological developments), and individual competition and product orientation (stratified staff, not valued staff input on vision, lost learning as the goal).

Purington, C., Butler, C., & Gale, S. F. (2003). *Built to learn: The inside story of how Rockwell Collins became a true learning organization*. New York: Amacom.

Riggs, D. E., (1997). A commitment to making the library a learning organization. *College and Research Library News*. 58(4), 297-98. Retrieved from <http://crl.acrl.org/content/58/4.toc>

Is the library already a LO? They change, do more with less, keep up with technological changes, adapt to online environment. Entire library staff, esp library leaders – set stage, model good behavior, provide resources. “Because boundaries are collapsing within libraries, there is a sense of urgency for staff to know as much as possible about all areas of the library. We are witnessing more people working among various units in the library; thus, we have a greater interdependence among library staff. However, this type of symbiosis requires a larger spectrum of learning

August 4, 2010

activities, thus fitting nicely with the concepts of a learning organization” (298). “The LO concept offers a wonderful and compelling challenge to improve out library staffs, which will subsequently strengthen the services provided for our users” (298).

Rowley, J. (1997). The Library as a Learning Organization. *Library Management* 18(2), 88-91. Retrieved from <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=858836&show=pdf>

LO is “an organization which facilitates the learning of all its members and continuously transforms itself (Pedler et al. 1998). Further, it has a climate in which individual members are encouraged to learn and develop to their full potential, extends this learning culture to include customers, suppliers, and other stakeholders, makes human resource development strategy central to business policy, and it is a continuous process of organizational transformation.” Rowley argues that the library is uniquely challenged b/c its environment is shaped by market economy as well as business and political agendas. Can the library become an LO?

THERE IS NO RIGHT MODEL FOR A LEARNING ORGANIZATION (call to collaboration?), develop values, practices, and procedures in which learning and working are synonymous throughout the organization by:

- Participative policy making, IT harnessed to inform and empower people to ask questions and make decisions based on available data, formative accounting, internal exchange, reward flexibility, front line workers as environmental scanners, intercompany learning ... integrate learning into all aspects of the organization. Depends on the commitment of individuals to their own learning. Respect learning styles (activist, reflector, theorist and pragmatist)
- Managers: draw out strengths and weaknesses of staff, reward their people for risks, seek to identify learning opportunities for staff, give personal time for staff development, involve their subordinates in their own tasks, share some of their problems, listen rather than talk, do not seek to shape individuals as replicas of themselves, take risks

August 4, 2010

- Barriers: formal training vs. day to day learning, sectionalism defines status quo, learning is linked to power, group loyalties
- Barriers to libraries: tension between public service, political agendas, and business efficiency results in an ambiguous mission that can undermine effective learning; mixture of staff with varying commitment levels

Salisbury, M. (2009). *iLearning: How to Create an Innovative Learning Organization*. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.

- knowing the best old way gives them the opportunity to learn and the resources to create a better new way – that's innovation (xxviii)

Schachter, D. (December 2006). The learning organization. *Information Outlook*, 10(12), 8-9. Retrieved from <http://www.sla.org/io/2006/12/>

Suggests that in businesses, the library can be the information center and that “the library is the informal hub for information exchange between users” (9). Can the library be this place of informal knowledge sharing as a library in and of itself?

Senge, P. (1994). *The fifth discipline field book: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. New York: Currency.

**5<sup>th</sup> discipline:** shared vision, personal mastery, mental models, group learning, and systems thinking. LO is “an organization that is continually expanding its capacity to create its future.” 14. (generally perceived as too abstract)

--. (1999). *The dance of change: The challenges of sustaining momentum in learning organizations*. New York: Currency/Doubleday.

--. (1990). The leader's new work: Building learning organizations. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 32(1), 7-22. Retrieved from <http://sloanreview.mit.edu/executive-adviser/may-2010/>



August 4, 2010

Sewell, J. (2004). Building a Learning Organization @ Your Library. *MLA Forum*. 3(1). Retrieved from

<http://www.mlaforum.org/volumeIII/issue1/Article3learningOrg.html>

Article based on the transformation of Multnomah Public Library in Portland, Oregon. Steps: Everyone must be on board, especially staff must commit to the whole organization, (Oregon) hire a Learning Systems Manager – facilitator, start with hiring – hire good people, orientation – build shared vision, training – reconstructed, focus on systems thinking and practice, just-in-time learning – learning at all times usually from colleagues (enhances team building), team building – job rotation program, individual learning plans with self-assessment tool (learning library’s commitment to personal growth will be reflected in the budget; customers are a fertile source of ideas – Garvin; encourage staff to be active in the community; be active in professional organizations). Results in job satisfaction and higher retention, and “we become the very best librarians we can be”

Siess, J. (2010). Embedded Librarianship: The Next Big Thing?. *Searcher*, 18(1), 38-45. Retrieved from

<http://www.infoday.com/searcher/jan10/index.shtml>

Society for Organizational Learning. <http://www.solonline.org/>

Smith, S. (2009). Growing Learning Champions at Denver Public Library. Web Junction.

<http://www.webjunction.org/learning-organization/-/articles/content/61734622>

- strategies for encouraging learning
- list of blogs

Sutherland, S. (August 1-9, 2003). The Public Library as a Learning Organisation. *World Library and*

*Information Congress: 69<sup>th</sup> IFLA General Conference and Council*. Berlin. Retrieved from

<http://archive.ifla.org/IV/ifla69/papers/111e-Sutherland.pdf>

Sutherland outlines Christchurch libraries in New Zealand and their focus on learning based on IFLA’s mission. Implementation of Aokozones – learning centers, “learning islands in the midst

August 4, 2010

of the rich information resources of your local public library” – a defined space in a library within a module of 6 PCs, targeted at 12 to 13 year olds. Christchurch is opening 2 libraries that will offer programs focusing on IT in their learning centre, focusing on computing for free. In addition to these programs, Sutherland defines an LO and outlines two programs geared towards nurturing the LO: leadership development programme (focusing on developing 12 team leaders) and keeping fit for the job (foster on-going learning).

Watkins, K. E., & Marsick, V. J. (1993). *Sculpting the Learning Organization: Lessons in the Art and Science of Systemic Change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Six action imperatives: to create continuous learning opportunities; to promote inquiry and dialogue; to encourage collaboration and team-learning; to establish systems to capture and share learning; to empower people toward collective vision; and to connect the organization to its environment.

Wilson, R. A. (2007). The library as learning organization. *PNLA Quarterly*, 71(4), 11, 20. Retrieved from <http://www.pnla.org/quarterly/index.htm>

Describes the steps Idaho Commission for Libraries began taking long ago to transform their organization into a LO (Henrich, 163). Central to their efforts was the “recognition and acceptance that all workers need to learn how to learn.” Wilson states that it is the role of management to create an environment in which this learning can happen. Steps: 1980s, facilitation training to 15 employees who evaluated internal agency meetings and then developed ground rules (all participate as equals; open, honest, respectful communication; aim for consensus; stick to agenda; ‘bin’ for tangential ideas; no silent disagreement; disagree with grace and tact; enjoy yourself). Next step, review mission, goals, and vision, thereby extending same values and rights of patrons to staff members (open management meetings and shared notes).

August 4, 2010

Third, create teams. Fourth, integrate continuous improvement techniques (you decide how you do your job in collaboration with other key stakeholders).

LOs need 3 things: knowledge workers, an environment to sustain learning, and the application of what is learned to create the future of the organization.

- 2009, Libraries=Learning Organizations, electronic conference in June 2009. Informed of Senge's 5 disciplines

Worrell, D. (1995). The learning organization: Management theory for the information age or new age fad?. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 21(5), 351. doi:10.1016/0099-1333(95)90060-8

Historical perspective of the learning organization, starting with Argyis and Schon, Peter Senge, and David Garvin. LO is not a fad, but is perhaps too idealistic in nature. Rapid change in any situation is most likely to be rejected, but slower change modeled on the LO may help organizations.