

Strategic Planning as an Iterative, Emerging Process

Louis Becker and Olivia Kelley, University of Tennessee Libraries

Introduction

In February 2022, the authors received an invitation from our libraries' dean for all employees to participate in a strategic visioning process, with the hope that "as many library staff as possible will be engaged and involved in the creation of our strategic vision." The authors of this paper participated throughout the strategic planning process and suggested details of the process but did not direct the process. As Assessment Programs Librarian (Becker) and as an executive assistant who has since become Strategic Planning Coordinator (Kelley), strategic planning and assessing progress toward strategic goals are a large part of our work, but this work was much larger than either of us. Direction of the process was led by the dean of libraries, Steve Smith, who has supported this attempt to document and contextualize the process which emerged through collaborative effort by more than fifty members of the University of Tennessee Libraries staff. We would like to acknowledge all our coworkers' effort in working through, and to a certain extent creating, the process through months of committee work.

The creation of our previous 5-year strategic plan followed a fairly standard process: a committee was charged with drafting a strategic plan that would outline goals for the library in alignment with institutional priorities. Corresponding action items accompanied the goals, which were targeted and could be measured to determine progress. Most of these action items could be considered binary in the sense that they would either be accomplished or left incomplete.

Shortly after that strategic plan's adoption, we experienced institutional turbulence with turnover in the university's chancellorship and presidency. The lack of continuity in leadership left some questions as to the institutional priorities with which we were seeking to align. The COVID-19 pandemic also brought a high degree of uncertainty and change that altered what we could and should focus on to best support our university community.

By the time the strategic plan concluded in 2022, we had achieved much of what we had set out to do, but circumstances had rendered several action items irrelevant. Likewise, new priorities had emerged that had not been named in the plan. With this experience, our libraries' administration had an interest in embarking on creating a different kind of planning experience, one that responded to needs for greater ownership, adaptability, and tight alignment with university priorities.

These goals are not unique to our institution and are common priorities for strategic planning processes in academic library settings. Several scholars have considered ways that libraries can broaden participation for their strategic planning processes. Leebaw considers how lessons from Critical Management Studies (CMS) can be used to make strategic planning in academic libraries more inclusive,¹ and Yaukey demonstrates how an academic library successfully applied a CMS lens to conduct “bottom-up strategic planning.”² Beyond CMS, other scholars have recognized the importance that inclusive planning practices have in creating buy-in for the organization by cultivating shared leadership (wherein employees look beyond the needs of their position or department towards what is best for the entire library)³ and collective ownership.⁴

With rapid changes to the environments in which libraries operate, there is also interest in translating Agile methods to the strategic planning process for academic libraries.⁵ In 2001, a group of software developers formalized their concept for a different approach to their work—one which prioritizes individuals and interactions, working software, customer collaboration, and responding to change—in the “Agile Manifesto.”⁶ Since that time, project managers and other Agile proponents have found ways to apply Agile principles in a variety of contexts and industries.⁷ The iterative nature of Agile methodology is appealing for strategic planning, a process that is inherently cyclical. The values that are imbued in that methodology of communication, collaboration, and adaptation also resonate with the needs for transparency in strategic planning. Cervone identifies how Agile methodologies, particularly Scrum, could be used to improve the traditional strategic planning process for academic libraries.⁸ And Jaggars and Jones drew inspiration from Agile methodologies to transform the strategic planning process at the Ohio State University Libraries into a process that “increased flexibility and openness to unanticipated opportunities in its implementation.”⁹

Beyond Agile methodology, business literature provides a wealth of information on promoting organizational agility, which is the ability for an organization to adapt to changes in their environment, pivoting to stay relevant and deliver value to stakeholders.¹⁰ By taking actions to improve organizational agility, an organization can be better prepared to handle unforeseen challenges and to have a more constructive response.¹¹ The approach taken to strategic planning can strengthen organizational agility by focusing on broadening the perspectives of decision makers to understand how individual activities serve larger goals and the contextual factors that affect prioritization of those activities. This understanding allows for better decisions to be made, and to be made faster than if a shared awareness had not already been reached.

As in other industries, the business landscape for our institutions continues to change in ways that demand demonstration of value. To successfully do that, the field has coalesced around a need to tightly align our resources and services with the missions of the institutions we serve.¹² Additionally, collaborating with the larger institutional structure is a way to increase awareness of our contributions and communicate our value.¹³ This connection to institutional mission needs to be explicit, or libraries risk not communicating the significance of our contributions to stakeholder priorities.¹⁴

While the goals of greater ownership, adaptability, and tight alignment with university priorities for a strategic planning process are not specific to our organization, our planning process demonstrates a unique path by which to accomplish those goals.

Strategic Planning for Organizations inside Organizations

Academic libraries build and maintain strategic plans to focus their efforts and communicate their institutional priorities to internal and external stakeholders.¹⁵ Numerous reports of strategic planning processes emphasize the importance of alignment, but it is very easy for librarians to focus on their “traditional areas” of expertise and lose sight of priorities set by their college or university.¹⁶ As our university had completed a strategic visioning process—somewhat lengthened by the pandemic—in 2019-2021, the libraries sought to frame our new plan as a direct response to the university’s vision, using the university’s five main vision priorities as our major strategic aims, and identifying ways our work could support those aims.¹⁷

Phase I: Distributed Work and Employee Engagement

To engage library employees in the planning process, a broad-based call for volunteers was issued, and nearly fifty employees across departments and position types volunteered to participate. Six committees were formed – one for each priority of the university vision, plus a sixth committee charged with considering assessment and alignment of the plan with the university’s newly-adopted college-focused budget model. Reports from these committees would be evaluated by an Executive Committee, initially consisting of the libraries’ dean and senior administrators, a faculty and staff representative, a faculty leader from outside the library, and a strategic planning consultant. Each committee was led by co-chairs and had one member from the executive team designated as a resource for questions. While department heads did serve on committees, the co-chairs were deliberately chosen from employees without formal leadership titles.

After kicking off the process, the libraries’ dean determined that the libraries’ goals would be best met with a library-specific approach, and we moved forward with an executive committee composed exclusively of library employees. Thompson makes a case for using

external consultants to fill gaps in local skills and provide process expertise and unbiased critiques, but consultants are not required for successful planning.¹⁸ Casey argues for grassroots employee involvement in the planning process to improve buy-in to the eventual result.¹⁹ Leebaw emphasizes the value of non-leader involvement in planning to bring forth a broader diversity of ideas and perspectives.²⁰ While external leaders might have sped up the process somewhat, we believe that working with internal resources has increased staff engagement with the planning process and provided an opportunity for professional growth for those outside of traditional leadership positions.

The vision area committees were charged with providing recommendations to the libraries that addressed their assigned university priority. The libraries' dean's charge to the committee chairs emphasized that "we are using the campus' strategic vision and priorities as our strategic vision and priorities." The overarching goal was to plan for the libraries to support the university vision. Committees were provided with a sample workbook (see appendix) which collected administrative details about each recommendation, including estimates of costs and staff hours for one time and ongoing initiatives, as well as notes on possible benchmarks.

While this workbook seemed to suggest that the planning done by each committee would be detailed and focused on working out highly concrete goals under the university vision, the committees were not required to use the workbook template and could submit additional documents alongside or in place of the workbook. This permissive approach is reflective of the first Agile principle that individuals and interactions should be prioritized over processes and tools. Rather than rigid requirements for submission of recommendations which would have had a greater likelihood of producing more consistent results, the flexibility at this stage allowed for committees to cocreate their recommendations in their own way through their own discussions.

Reusing the university's strategic vision priorities meant that less effort needed to be spent on an external environmental scan than in traditional planning structures.

Thompson et al. spent a great deal of their planning process surveying their patrons and considering their external environment.²¹ We were not ignoring user feedback – a broad user satisfaction survey was conducted during the strategic planning process and certainly informed the planning conversations. But we could use the campus vision as a more direct guide to our stakeholders' concerns. To address questions of the broader environment and as a professional development opportunity for committee members, the libraries' dean invited several leaders from across the university and the academic library world to share their insights about the future of higher education, including challenges and opportunities. This activity served two primary purposes: it provided background to inform the

recommendations the committees produced, and it encouraged committee members to think more broadly about the higher education landscape.

The committee reports in this phase took widely differing forms. Some committees wrote their goals into longer reports to provide context and process information, while others listed their recommendations into adapted versions of the template spreadsheet. Those who used the spreadsheet approach tended to provide more detailed goals, with notes of departments or personnel who might be involved in implementing the recommendations. One group provided suggested timeframes for their recommendations. While several groups provided notes on how some recommendations might be assessed, no recommendations proposed quantitative benchmarks. Budget information proved impossible to gather at this phase. Even committees that returned spreadsheets ignored the budget column or provided only the vaguest sense of budget impact. While distributing goal-setting work throughout the organization can be fruitful for generating ideas and engaging employees in the process, many employees do not have the training or information necessary to estimate budget or staffing for strategic projects, especially in areas outside of their technical expertise.

Phase II: Feedback and Summarization

Following the creation of these reports, the reports were distributed across the entire organization. Feedback was gathered internally through organized listening sessions at department meetings. These listening sessions were conducted by two library faculty members who had co-chaired two of the visioning committees. Through this process, the administration received feedback on both individual proposals but also on the form of the plan and the planning process. Many of the recommendations were well received but the feedback revealed some shortcomings of the committee process. Some recommendations presented as new seemed to different groups to be reflected in ongoing work, or work that might be better shared with other partners within the university. In a large organization, even a distributed process with large-scale participation can inadvertently build silos. Delegating internal feedback to non-administrative employees may have improved the integrity of feedback at this stage.

At the same time, to confirm that the libraries' view of campus priorities aligned with campus priorities for the libraries, members of the executive committee set up listening sessions with university leadership, including the president, chancellor, and provost, as well as groups of deans and leadership teams from offices of Student Life, Student Success, Community Engagement, Teaching and Learning Innovation, information technology, and the extension service. Many of these conversations confirmed our shared understanding of the university's vision, while adding some details on current and future

needs for our growing and changing student body. These conversations also emphasized the university's desire to support faculty research and encouraged the libraries to improve and document our role in this aspect of the university's work. They also demonstrated the Agile principle of valuing customer collaboration; if the university community as users of the libraries' services and resources are our "customers," it is critical that we listen to their needs and collaborate on the strategic directions we will pursue. While working with the university's published vision aligned our plans to a certain extent, specific conversations helped the libraries move from the very broad language of the university vision to the specific priorities of our stakeholders.

The "Assessment and Alignment" committee, on which the authors served, was initially tasked with investigating recent assessments and the data available for assessment during the first phase of the project. Much of this work had already been undertaken by the Assessment Programs & Collection Strategy department, so the work of the committee involved updating existing documentation and proposing future directions for assessment infrastructure. After receiving the initial reports from the vision area committees, it was clear that it would be difficult to move directly into planning to assess individual initiatives. Instead, the executive committee asked the sixth committee to provide a thematic analysis of the five reports. Considering that many of the themes expressed in the written reports reflected the campus vision priorities, we decided to separate the recommendations from the language of their reports and use card-sorting techniques to categorize the various initiatives.²² Because the committee expected that library administration would need to understand the potential impact of the different proposals, we started by sorting proposals according to the kinds of changes sought, the area of service impacted, and the user groups the proposals sought to engage.

Removed from the various reporting formats, we found we had seventy-two ideas to consider. Some of these were near duplicates, some were very detailed, and others, broadly summative. After considering the three functional questions, we ended up with eight broad categories of recommendations:

- Communication/Outreach
- Facilities
- Improvements
- New Starts
- Process Changes
- Professional Development/Organizational Structure
- Technology Investments

- Visioning Statements (a category created for strategic aims that did not translate into a concrete goal)

Because we asked several questions during the sorting exercise, many recommendations fell into multiple categories. Each broad category was then divided into subcategories. Some subcategories were highly structured. The User Impact category, for example, was divided into items designed to impact our students and faculty, the larger state community, or our role in the larger scholarly environment. In others, the emergent sorting process led to less binary divisions; the Communication/Outreach theme developed subcategories for both ideas targeted to specific audiences (Students, Campus, Community) and ideas emphasizing communication for specific programs (DEI, Research, Instruction). To fill in some of the gaps left in the committees' spreadsheets, we sorted new processes and program changes into low, medium, and high investments of effort.

These sorting exercises helped uncover some common themes across the five reports, and a similar exercise would be used in the next iteration of idea generation as well. In this case, we actively tried to create categories that would be useful for further evaluation and selection of ideas for a complete plan.

Phase III: Retreat, Resummarize, Rewrite

Even after the completion of this second phase, the executive committee saw value in using a third phase to further synthesize ideas for the future and articulate the values that should underlie our vision. This iterative approach used in our planning process bears resemblance to the Agile methodology, where teams complete work in distinct, time-bound phases, which build on one another to produce a final product. While our planning process reflects the ethos of the Agile methodology, we do not suggest that it represents an intentional implementation of any Agile framework. Rather than following a recipe where the totality of the process was outlined from the outset, our planning process involved iterations in which leadership reviewed work completed in the previous phase and identified the missing ingredients to be added before completion.

The executive committee brought together the chairs of each of the six committees, the executive committee, plus assessment and marketing personnel for a day and a half of retreat and discussion. Rather than working directly with the documents created thus far, this larger group discussion appeared to in some ways restart a traditional strategic planning process. The structure of this retreat was similar to one described by Casey.²³ While Casey's team brought suggestions for improvements and changes to the meeting directly from individuals, we came to this phase with two rounds of recommendations

already discussed and organized. Everyone in the meeting was expected to be familiar with all of these reports.

Two exercises set a brainstorming background on the first day of the “retreat.” First, we were asked to consider the values that should guide the libraries considering the planning documents created so far as well as our own experiences in the organization. Participants broke into small groups to discuss their proposed value phrases. Each group proposed five to ten possible value phrases, and a wide-ranging group discussion followed. We ended with seven University of Tennessee Libraries values. The second activity, led by the libraries' marketing team, invited the group to develop a title or tagline for the mission.

The exercises on the second day of the “retreat” might be seen as a classic strategic planning session in miniature. We were invited to think of projects we could be doing to support each of the seven values identified on the first day. These projects were then card-sorted into themes and condensed by subgroup work into priority vision statements for that value.

The large group was then invited to consider the roses, thorns, and buds (or Strengths, Weaknesses/Barriers, and Opportunities) of each of these priorities.²⁴ The stated intention was that the opportunities we identified would lead to objectives and strategies in the completed plan. The discussion in this session, as in all the large-group sessions, was open and wide-ranging, covering everything from user services to professional development and employee policies.

Post-retreat, the executive committee then assembled the completed vision statements, drawing from all of the assembled documentation across the three phases of the plan. The final vision was written largely by the libraries' dean and associate dean, with input from the libraries' marketing team. While the discussion at the final retreat was a major source for the final vision, those who created the final vision indicated that they drew on all phases of the work. In the end, even an inclusive, grassroots project requires executive authorship and decision-making.

Conclusions

The University of Tennessee Libraries' strategic planning journey started with an attempt to shortcut directly to planning concrete goals and ended with a vision statement notably lacking in specific goals and measurable benchmarks. What have we gained from our iterative process? While some may have recommended that we skip directly to the focused retreat and its rapid brainstorming, a limited number of people could meaningfully participate in that forum. The first phase of the process allowed a wide range of employees to participate in the planning process and engage with the university's vision. Starting from

the university's vision statements meant that we stayed aligned with stakeholder priorities from the beginning of the planning process. By assembling the initial committees from across the libraries, we also reduced proposals of "pet" departmental projects that might have arisen from committees organized by library functional areas. We also received clear feedback that some of our existing departmental structures were not well aligned for the future. Similarly, the second phase of feedback from departments and stakeholders was a necessary corrective to some ideas that appeared clear and necessary to a group focused only on a given university priority but might not align well with the ongoing work of the library. The participants in the final retreat were prepared for that high-level strategic discussion because of the time they spent working with the individual committees and the resulting reports. After four months and three phases, moving from the university's broad vision through many individual recommendations, suggestions and fragments thereof, we arrived at a shared and shareable vision for the libraries. Collaboration and adjustment, and a willingness to temporarily overlook some details, would seem to be required for the vision to incorporate so many of our perspectives. We will be able to adopt the details we need as we follow through on our vision together.

The strategic vision was finalized and shared internally in April 2023, and externally via our library website in May 2023. Just a few months later, the administration announced a "realignment" that eliminated two departments and created five new ones. The changes were presented as a direct response to recommendations proposed during the visioning processes, including functional alignment with campus strategic directions; a need to ensure employee wellness, workload balance, and sustainability are embedded in our practices; and university leadership requests for alignment with the teaching and research missions of the university.

Our leadership indicated that they felt the organization's reception to the realignment was a testament to the buy-in generated through our visioning process. We had spent over a year gathering and considering feedback from stakeholders related to priorities, and the resulting action to align our expertise and organizational structure with those priorities was met with understanding, and even enthusiasm for some.

Our final vision lacks any sort of action items, benchmarks, or metrics. There is no designation of which departments or librarians have responsibility for executing individual vision priorities. But it perhaps best encapsulates the fourth core principle of agile methodology, which places greater value on "responding to change over following a plan." The hope is that no matter the obstacles and opportunities that the future will bring, we have created a vision that can be responsive to change, guiding our work without enumerating it. While this whole library vision should remain relevant despite the

departure of individual employees or further rearrangements of departments, we risk the vision remaining a paper dream without individual responsibility. This departure from a standard strategic plan has meant that we need to craft a new approach to tracking progress towards our vision.

Looking Ahead

In January 2024, one of the co-authors (Kelley), moved into a new role in the organization: Strategic Planning Coordinator. The creation of this position itself is in part a recognition that while we have a strategic vision to focus our work, strategic planning is an ongoing activity and requires dedicated efforts. Looking to imbue the values of participation and flexibility that were present in our visioning process, Kelley facilitates a committee charged with gathering information from departments to capture the full picture of the multitude of ways our organization is living our vision. Once the group has a greater sense of our current activities, our charge also includes making recommendations for new programs, changes, or initiatives to be taken in areas that haven't received as much focus. The goal is that by using a large committee who will directly engage with departments, we will continue to keep the vision on the organization's mind rather than gathering dust on a shelf. While some recommendations may draw from those generated in the earliest stage of our visioning process, the flexibility to collaborate with departments on new recommendations will help ensure they are the most relevant and allow us to take advantage of opportunities presented by rapidly changing technological and higher education landscapes.

In many ways, our "nimble and adaptable" strategic process is still ongoing. Perhaps we are pursuing an Agile mindset by releasing a 'vision' statement rather than waiting to release a document until we had planned every aspect down to the last benchmark. There will be next steps, but in the meantime our organization knows the broad outline of where we need to go to support the university and is already moving in that direction. We have a language to use when proposing projects and describing goals that aligns with our stakeholders' needs. Strategic planning is an exercise in communication, and communication is continuing.

Appendix: Sample Phase I Spreadsheet

UT Libraries						
Strategic Vision						
Priorities/Recommendations						
Priority #1: Cultivating the Volunteer Experience						
Recommendations	Responsibility	Cost (if known)	Is Cost one-time or ongoing?	FTE hours per month (if known)	Are FTE hours one-time or ongoing?	Benchmark(s)/Notes

¹ Danya Leebaw, “Participatory and Ethical Strategic Planning: What Academic Libraries Can Learn from Critical Management Studies,” *Library Trends* 68, no. 2 (2019): 110–29.

² Suzanna Yaukey, “Moving to a Strategic Management Model: Using Bryson’s Strategy Change Cycle for Bottom-Up Virtual Strategic Planning in an Academic Library,” *Journal of Library Administration* 63, no. 8 (November 17, 2023): 1090–1103, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2023.2281344>.

³ Laura Krier, “A Framework for Shared Leadership: A Perspective on Strategic Planning for Academic Libraries,” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 48, no. 6 (2022): 102503, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2022.102503>.

⁴ Aaron L. Brenner, Robin Kear, and Eve Wider, “Reinvigorating Strategic Planning: An Inclusive, Collaborative Process,” *College & Research Libraries News; Vol 78, No 1 (2017): DOI - 10.5860/Crln.78.1.9604.28-29*

⁵ H. Frank Cervone, “Improving Strategic Planning by Adapting Agile Methods to the Planning Process,” *Journal of Library Administration* 54, no. 2 (February 17, 2014): 155–68, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2014.903371>.

⁶ “The Agile Manifesto,” Agile Alliance, accessed October 3, 2024, <https://www.agilealliance.org/agile101/the-agile-manifesto/>.

⁷ Kristy Moeller, “Navigating the Future of Work with an Agile Mindset,” pmi.org, Project Management Institute, September 2023, <https://www.pmi.org/learning/thought-leadership/navigating-the-future-of-work-with-an-agile-mindset>.

⁸ H. Frank Cervone, “Improving Strategic Planning by Adapting Agile Methods to the Planning Process,” *Journal of Library Administration* 54, no. 2 (2018): 155–68, doi:10.1080/01930826.2014.903371.

-
- ⁹ Damon Jaggars and DeEtta Jones, “An agile planning and operations framework,” *Performance Measurement and Metrics* 19, no. 2 (2018): 121-126, <https://doi-org.utk.idm.oclc.org/10.1108/PMM-11-2017-0057>.
- ¹⁰ Linda Holbeche, “Designing sustainably agile and resilient organizations,” *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 36, no. 5 (2019): 668-677, <https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2624>.
- ¹¹ Steven H. Appelbaum et al., “The Challenges of Organizational Agility (Part 1).,” *Industrial & Commercial Training* 49, no. 1 (2017): 6–14, <https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-05-2016-0027>.
- ¹² Association of College and Research Libraries, *Value of Academic Libraries: A Comprehensive Research Review and Report*, prepared by Megan Oakleaf (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 2010), http://www.ala.org/acrl/sites/ala.org.acrl/files/content/issues/value/val_report.pdf.
- ¹³ Scott Walter, “Communicating value through strategic engagement: Promoting awareness of the “value of libraries” through alignment across academic, student, and administrative affairs,” *Library Management* 39, no. 3/4 (2018): 154-165, <https://doi.org/10.1108/LM-09-2017-0093>.
- ¹⁴ Laura Saunders, “Room for Improvement: Priorities in Academic Libraries’ Strategic Plans,” *Journal of Library Administration* 56, no. 1 (2015): 1-16, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2015.1105029>.
- ¹⁵ Tatiana Sanches, “Shrink to Fit or Prune to Strengthen: Adapting the Strategic Plan in an Academic Library as Response to Environmental Change,” *New Review of Academic Librarianship* 24, no. 3–4 (October 2, 2018): 310–25, <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2018.1501714>; Gregory C. (Gregory Coyne) Thompson et al., *Strategic Planning for Academic Libraries: A Step-by-Step Guide* (Chicago: ALA Editions, 2019).
- ¹⁶ Laura Saunders, “Academic Libraries’ Strategic Plans: Top Trends and Under-Recognized Areas,” *The Journal of Academic Librarianship* 41, no. 3 (2015): 285–91, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2015.03.011>; Laura Saunders, “Room for Improvement: Priorities in Academic Libraries’ Strategic Plans,” *Journal of Library Administration* 56, no. 1 (2016): 1–16, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2015.1105029>.
- ¹⁷ “Vision,” Office of the Chancellor, accessed 9/4/2024, <https://chancellor.utk.edu/vision/>.
- ¹⁸ Thompson et al., *Strategic Planning for Academic Libraries: A Step-by-Step Guide.*, 13-15,51.
- ¹⁹ Anne Marie Casey, “Grassroots Strategic Planning: Involving Library Staff from the Beginning,” *Journal of Library Administration* 55, no. 4 (May 19, 2015): 329–40, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2015.1038935>.
- ²⁰ Leebaw, “Participatory and Ethical Strategic Planning.”, 121-122.
- ²¹ Thompson et al., *Strategic Planning for Academic Libraries: A Step-by-Step Guide.*, 17-23.
- ²² For a description of card-sorting methodology, see Donna Spencer, *Card Sorting Designing Usable Categories* (Brooklyn, N.Y: Rosenfeld Media, 2009).
- ²³ Casey, “Grassroots Strategic Planning,” 332.

²⁴ SWOT analysis has been used in many strategic planning processes. See for example: Sanches, “Shrink to Fit or Prune to Strengthen”; Kabel Nathan Stanwicks, “From SWOT to Success: The Collaborative Strategic Planning Journey of an Academic Library Department.,” *Library Leadership & Management* 37, no. 3 (January 2024): 1–21. and Yaukey, “Moving to a Strategic Management Model.”