SESSION I
Library Review Follow-up Meeting
March 7, 2006   10:00 – 11:15 a.m.

27 people present (Inc. Jim Cogswell & following members from ORTF: Mike Muchow, Rebecca Graves & Michael Bland.)

The following is a paraphrased summary of the discussion.

Mike Muchow convened the meeting.

Mary Ryan: What is the Evolving Model Organization Chart?

Jim C: Graphic representation of the [Task Force] report. Sum of the recommendations, ones he is endorsing which were presented at the 1/31/06 meeting. This is not meant to be a fully formed model of the organization. It's meant to help visual folks with the report.

Mary R: Government Documents being under the Branches is not in the narrative report.

Jim C: that was a surprise to him as well.

Mike M: Where do we put things? We talked about what's a Branch library. Had considered putting Special Collections & Archives under branches as well.   The director wanted Special Collections pulled out. Basically an arbitrary decision where to place some units.

Mary R: suggest that Government Documents be kept where it is under Reference. It is a part of reference.

Rebecca G: reiterated that decisions were the best possible given information on hand at the time. ORTF didn't have the info that Gov Docs was being blended into Reference. This decision is changeable.

Geoff S: Government Documents will wither away. Library didn't want to put time and effort into cataloging government materials [in the past]. Morphing from a separate department to a subject specialist. This process [today's meeting] can be used to get this information out.

Mike M: Branch libraries are problematic. Branch librarians are basically equal to reference librarians.

Cindy C: Special Collections – why is this separate?

Mike M: Jim wanted SCARaB separate for funding. Jim also wanted few direct lines/reports.

Jim C: Mike said it well. SCARaB represents a core of future research. Digitization will make it accessible. And it is also a potential growth area for funding raising (e.g. private donors.)

Geoff S: SCARaB is a dumping ground for formats that no one know what to do with. So, do microforms fit in?

Rebecca G & Mike M: ORTF had no plans on that. Figured that the head of & folks in SCARaB would decide.

Jim C: microforms will probably move but not overnight. Hope to move Archives back into Ellis when the Historical Society moves out.

Employee A (Didn't know name): What will happen to microforms?

Rachel B: Microforms do get used. Under copyright laws we cant just put microforms on web. Only microfiche has all articles by freelancers due to change in copyright. So there's a demand for them. Faculty are asking that microforms be purchased as online databases don't always/often contain freelance articles.

Mary R: Shows that different disciplines have different needs.

Mike M: Another way to look at it is space planning. E.g. it doesn't make sense to have scattered microfiche throughout the building. Let's put them in one place. Look at the library as a whole. The org chart is not a big deal. Try something with a review mechanism. If it works, keep it. If not, change it.

Bob A: Problems at MU. In 1991 a previous director sent him to ALA meeting. Library directors were already spending 50% of their time fund raising at that time. Our organizational model didn't allow for that. Our org chart held the director back from fund raising which is crucial these days especially since education isn't getting state support.

Mike M: [didn't record comments]

Amanda S: Feedback is key. In large institutions, what often happens is that things just get chewed over and nothing happens. Fear of "what if we change something and it doesn't work?" Need feedback/review methods so that we can monitor change and embolden people to change. So what if it doesn't work. What if it does work? A top heavy system is not limber.

Brenda G: In a hierarchical system once things get changed they tend to get stuck. How do we allow for things to change?

Mike M: problem is in upper structure. Went over divisions:
      Admin – grab bag
      Resources – basically Alice Allen's job
      User Ser. – need to coordinate user services
      HSL – Elephant, ¼ of services budget goes there.
      Technology Services – need to have equal access to IT
Director pulled SCARaB off . Concern, what if we get a User Services or Resource Services Associate Director that is a dork?

Amanda S: [didn't record comments]

Mike M: Associate Directors are key for getting things done. How do you get things done?

Rebecca G: Need to have cohesion and to focus our efforts

Mary R: problem was she didn't know how to read the Org Chart. Is it a done deal or open to debate?

Jim C: Sees report & chart as the point of discussion so that we call all become vested in solutions. For example: sees Users Services Assistant Director as critical for coordination. Jim is being pulled into policy & decision making that fragments him and the library.

One of the themes Jim hears emerging at this meeting is Action. At some point we need to take steps to do things differently. Look at Jim's slides for his intentions.
http://mulibraries.missouri.edu/admin/OrgReviewPresentation.pdf
User Services – he's considering a temporary head until it's a permanent position. Technical Services – he intends to hire a replacement for Alice. He is establishing task forces for looking at technical services & ILL across the system.

Wants vested changes & cohesion in the library. Doesn't want dictates on high. Applauds Rachel for raising question as to whether money should go for more shelvers/reference librarians instead of another Assistant Director. We need more unification. Didn't know if there had every been a head or assistant director over User Services.

Mary R: Harry Butler was head of User Services. Job went away in early 70's. The next director had wanted one deputy directory that all reported to.

Jim C: That's not the model that he wants. Jim needs time for fund raising. Yet he doesn't want one deputy director between him and staff. He doesn't want to be divorced from staff.

Mary R: This meeting has clarified what is negotiable and what's not.

Jim C: Has trouble with "non-negotiable". Think of this as a road map not a blue print. Would like to articulate better the library's goals & vision. We need more cohesion in user services. HSL & SCARaB are growth areas ($$$).

Geoff S: Library council, where is it in the chart?

Mike M: ORTF talked about that. Decided that it's the Director's council and up to him to constitute.

Jim C: The ORTF report did outline an advisory group comprising the 3 Associate Directors plus Technology Services. Clearly there will be an advisory group which will include strategic areas of the chart. But it's not determined yet.

Mike M: The Director needs to get good information. At the bare minimum need the Associate Directors and Technology Services head input.

Geoff S: So the direct reports.

Mike M: Could go both ways.

Jim C: The danger is isolation which is worse [or bigger danger] at higher levels. He's working to not build in isolation. Wants to include stakeholders. Again, an evolving model.

Employee B (Didn't know name): How is this going to affect us? I directly serve patrons. Is this going to help us serve patrons better?

Jim C: I sure hope so. I would how that direct services to users will be brought together.

Mike M: no one in his view is going to be picked up and moved around at least not initially. A task force will look at integrating Ellis & HSL Technical Services & ILL. Hopes that someone will look at Ellis Reference, User Services and see if we're doing the best that we can.

Different ways to thing about it. Not going to change for awhile, but will change.

Mary R: without disrespect, a great deal of coordination & collaboration goes on everyday.

Mike M: Hurt feelings – doesn't want anyone to think that ORTF thought people were doing a bad job. Shouldn't be a subculture for getting things done. Things shouldn't be done on an ad hoc basis.

So many times people do things and they don't get appreciated. That's unfortunate.

Amanda S: as a newbie I see that we keep reinventing the wheel because the information never filters down or out.

Jim C: is this meeting a good forum? Is it helpful to people?

Amanda S: Yes, especially at the beginning of the process. Might need to be more focused down the road.

Jim C: Working a vision/mission to up date the ones that we have. Working on a better way of talking about what we're all about and how to get there. Is anyone interested in that? Is that something for meetings like this?

Employee C (Didn't know name): recommend showing the PowerPoint from the University. [I didn't get the full info. I think that the point was there's a promotional PowerPoint about the university & that it'd be good for the library employees to see this.]

Jim C: If we don't have a common mission we'll all go off in separate directions. Need to make sure we're in tandem.

Mike B: Touched on assessment. We need a formalized method of assessment. How are we doing? Who do we talk to? Without assessment, we've no way of knowing whether to change or to stay the same. Will also help Jim with his vision. Not just for projects but also for managerial styles. For example, Mike B would like to be evaluated not just from staff but also from peers – how is he doing? Etc.

Jim C: In-action is not an option.

Geoff S: Isn't that up to us?

Mike M: Yes & no. We need to take responsibility for our selves, our areas.

Geoff S: So, it's up to us.

- End-

SESSION II
ORTR Follow-Up Meeting
March 7th, 2006

Question: Is the Director going to be at this meeting?
Answer: Probably not. This might be a problem.

Question: Who put together the Organization Function Chart?
Answer: ORTF created the chart.

Question: Why was Government Documents units put under the Branch Libraries?
Answer: ORTF saw nothing special about branch libraries, except being outside of Ellis and looked at Special Collections, Rare Books, and Gov Docs as branch libraries in Ellis. When Special Collections and Rare Books were pulled out to form Scarab, Gov Docs was left alone.

Question: Is this Function Chart a "done deal"?
Answer: The top level divisions probably are, but the lower levels are not. The units underneath the division, Admin Services, Resources Management, and User Services can be moved to other divisions/department if the move is best for the libraries as a whole.

Question: On the Function Chart, why was the make-up of the Reference not clear, several things are listed twice.
Answer: This is a mistake on the chart.

Questions: As to the new positions, where is the funding going to be found to pay for these people that might have to be "given up" to get people into these positions?
Answers: Funding is a problem that the director thinks can be solved. One of ORTF recommendations was that every vacant position be reviewed. If a position in another part of the library needs to be filled more urgently, that position should be filled.

Question: The title for Resource Management, can it be changed and why was Tech Services renamed in the first place?
Answer: The titles of the divisions are up for change as far as ORTF knows. ORTF pulled LTS out of Tech Services and called it Technology Services. ORTF thought having a Technical Services and a Technology Services might cause confusion.

Statement: Four Library Assistant Is could be hired as opposed to hiring a division leader for User Services.
Answer: True. But the director thinks that there is a greater need for a head of User Services. That person would coordinate user activities and providing excellent user services is a mission of the Libraries.

Question: Don't we have a Collection Development Librarian now?
Answer: We don't have a head of collection development now. We have the CDC. ORTF tried to set up a organization were a person and not a committee was responsible. The idea is that everyone in the libraries would know whom to speak to if they had a question or problem with collection development. ORTF was trying to bring the "shadow network" out in the open.

Question: What is the shadow network?
Answer: A shadow network is the network of people who get things done. Individuals know other individuals who can help them and go to them when they have a problem.

Follow-Up: But I think that is a good idea. It makes things easier to do.
Answer: It makes things easier for those in the know. But if you are new to the organization you might not know whom to ask. ORTF would like to bring this out into the open so that everyone know whom they have to see to get   something done.

Question: How can we get input into committees and into processes in general?
Answer: This is problem that ORTF recognizes but did not specifically address.
The library forums seem successful and we hope that more are held. We also think there should be a way for the staff to bring up ideas and suggestions. ORTF recommended that all committees have charges, goals, and deadlines to help them become more productive.

Question: I do not feel empowered. Did ORTF make any recommendations that will help in this area.
Answer: **** not specifically answered****

Question: I don't think setting service goals is realistic. Would service improve if I tally up how many times I serve someone?
Answer: Finding ways to measure service is difficult, but it is something the entire library has to start doing. We have to start asking our patrons what they want and if we are satisfying them. Also, stressing service to our users does not mean that we are doing a poor job now. It means that we need to continually find new and better ways to serve them.

Statement: The director of libraries needs to see what people are doing. I wish he would come and watch what I do.

Question:	What about 360 degree evaluation?
Answer:	ORTF likes the idea but does not know if it will be implemented.

Question: Was it intended for the Director of Libraries to come up with the vision?
Answer: Yes.

Question: What if he comes up with screwy vision or asks us to do something impossible.
Answer: We would hope that he does not come up with an outlandish vision and that his goals be manageable and achievable. If the director did set an impossible goal, we expect that his deputies would tell him.

Question: When will the task force for unification of ILL and Tech Services be formed?
Answer: THIS NEEDS ANSWER************************************

Question: Was there input from the branches during the ORTF questioning?
Answer: We did solicit and receive input from branch staff, but mainly from HSL.

Question: Why didn't ORTF solicit more input from the staff in creating the organization?
Answer: ORTF did solicit input through an email request. Some input came from one-on-one talks. Frankly, ORTF did not have enough time to conduct staff meetings and solicit input.

Statement: Once all of these follow-up meetings are complete it would be good to have a summation from the director of all that was asked and answered during the meetings.
Answer: We are trying to take notes as best we can.

Question: Doesn't the director need to bring a lot of money into the libraries?
Follow-Up: Yes. ORTF tried to give the director fewer direct reports and free his time to focus on fundraising

Question: The director did not what a deputy director, why?
Answer: He did not want to become detached form the library. He felt having a deputy director would isolate him.
--END—

<div align="center">

ORTF Follow-up Meeting – Session III
March 9, 2005
10:00-11:00 a.m.
Memorial Union, North 112

</div>

Opening

Mike Muchow reviewed the ORTF charge and the requirements of the Director:
- Fewer direct reports to the Director
- Fewer day-to-day operational decisions made by the Director
- Hierarchical structure
- HSL (Health Sciences Library) is a "super branch"– life sciences and health sciences are growth areas at MU
- SCARaB (Special Collections, Archives, and Rare Books)– collections are unique to the MU Libraries and promote the libraries and raise money

Discussion, Questions, Comments and Responses

Q- The recommendations state that the Director will invite the heads of HSL and SCARaB to discussions whenever appropriate. What about the Head of LTS? I think LTS should be involved in planning and decision making.

R- The Task Force recognizes that LTS plays an important role in the operations and services of the MU Libraries, and that is why we recommended that LTS become a new independent unit that will report to the Director.

Topic: Possible merger of Ellis and HSL technical services and ILL. Objectives:
- to coordinate services and processes
- to provide the same excellent, quality service to all users

Q- Why is there so much focus on the organizational chart?
>   R- The functions chart was a low priority for the task force. We view the chart as an evolving model or plan.
>   Comment: There is danger in focusing on the organizational chart.

Other Recommendations made by ORTF:
- Provide training on topics such as: how to conduct meetings; how to resolve conflict; how to establish goals and measure success; etc. The Staff Development Committee (SDC) will be working with the Director to develop programming that addresses training needs.

- The Director shared elements of a new vision focused on serving our users.   We are "one library" and we are "user-centered". The Director is working on developing the new vision and mission statement for the MU Libraries.
- SCARaB – a lever to bring in more money and increase our prestige.
- HSL – the life science and health sciences are areas of emphasis for MU
- Goal setting – set goals and measure our success; should emphasize quality vs. quantity
- Tracking what departments, committees, task forces, etc. are doing.

Comment - There is a need for better coordination of functions across divisions. Take, for example, the management of electronic resources. Reference manages and trouble-shoots electronic databases and Acquisitions manages and trouble-shoots electronic journals. Could we coordinate the functions to reduce redundancy and increase efficiency?
>   R- One of the outcomes that the ORTF hopes for will be the clarification of where conversations to propose changes, identify problems, and suggest/create solutions can take place (i.e. discussion and idea forums, administrative group, etc.)

Discussion topic: Identifying Users
- Who are our users? Units/branches would probably not agree.
- We all serve users and we are all each others' internal users/customers.
- We need mechanisms in place to get things done when we can't get our needs satisfied.

Reminder: The ORTF recommendations are a rough road path. It is not a blue print. You should look at it broadly. Look at Jim's slides from the all staff meeting to find out what he endorses and how he plans to move forward. Be cautious about looking at your own specific area.   It was not the charge of the task force to review the entire organizational structure.

Q- When will the Director delegate to others?
>   R- When the key players are in place. A Head of User Services and a Head of Resources Management need to be hired. The Director will decide who the members of his administrative group will be.

Implementation Schedule– What we know:
- The Director told us at the All Staff Meeting which recommendations he is going to move forward with.
- SDC will be helping the Director with designing programming for training needs.
- The Director has appointed a search committee for a Head of Resources Management.

- The Director has appointed a task force to investigate and make a recommendation regarding the possible merger of Ellis and HSL technical services.

Discussion topic: Serving Users
- We have not done a good job of finding out what our users want.
- I thought we were already focusing on serving users.
- What is the libraries' role in teaching students how to use the library?
- Maybe we need to do more outreach.
- We need a way to assess users' wants and needs.
- How do we balance users' wants with our services?
- How can we make things more convenient for our users?

Q- Will the Libraries be hiring executive assistants to the new division heads?
  R – That was not considered by ORTF. We envision the division heads will be assisted by their department heads.

Comment- It looks like we are putting a lot of stock in getting new people to come in and save us. I'm concerned about that, especially since we have recently had difficulty recruiting.

Q- How do we know this new administrative model will work?
  R- This is a traditional organizational structure, so we know it has worked in other libraries.
  ORTF examined numerous organizational models. ORTF hopes that assessment will take place.
  If we try something and it doesn't work, we can stop and do something different.

Closing

The purpose of the report was not to say we think we are not doing good jobs, but to recommend courses of action for the MU Libraries that will hopefully result in improving our ability as an organization to adapt to change and improve our services to users.