

Living the Future 4 Conference, April 24-27, 2002, Tucson, Arizona
Nathan Baum, April Brazill, and Janet Clarke

Table of Contents

- I. Recurrent Themes
- II. University of Arizona Library Organization
 - A. History
 - B. Structure
 - C. Other Highlights
- III. Highlights from Other Libraries
 - A. Brown University
 - B. University of Maryland
 - C. Indiana University/Purdue University
 - D. University of Connecticut
 - E. North Suburban Library System (NSLS) – Illinois
- IV. Pre-conference Workshop
 - A. Goals and Objectives
 - B. Survey Design and Sampling
 - C. Types of Survey Questions
 - D. Survey Administration
 - E. Data Analysis and Reports
 - F. Follow-up and Decisions
- V. Relevant websites

I. Recurrent Themes

Some overall themes that resonated among the various types of library reorganization presentations are:

- Libraries need to be flexible to accommodate changes in environment, such as budgets, technology, and new work. Typically, libraries tend to be inflexible organizations which in turn make change difficult.
- In order to make libraries more flexible, fluid organizations, the traditional hierarchy of library administration has been flattened with less emphasis on assistant directors and more emphasis on team work.
- This restructuring was done by looking at the organization, not from the organization's work processes, but from a client-centered focus.
- All this change is not without difficulty. These libraries worked for many years to bring about their reorganization and are still evolving.

II. University of Arizona Library Organization

A. History

The University of Arizona Library began in 1992 to reorganize when they were no longer getting the resources they needed to maintain functions and services and develop new ones. The first Living the Future Conference was held in 1994. This conference has been held every 2 years since then to help other libraries in the reorganization process.

At the U of A, reorganization/restructuring was based on putting “customers” first, asking “how do they use the library and what do they need when they come to the library?” The library began Strategic Long Range Planning (SLRP) Process by defining the library’s mission, vision, and goals. From SLRP, teams were developed to manage specific projects.

B. Structure

1. Flattened Hierarchy

Library teams came about because the library knew it was faced with new work: people were reassigned based on the work that needed to be done. They focused on desired outcomes (what do the library users want) and then worked backwards from there to the work that needed to be done to bring about these outcomes. (See discussion of Brown University library below for more information on how this works.)

In a team-based organization, there are no Assistant University Librarian (AUL) positions to make the “final decisions” on matters in their respective areas, such as Technical Services. Rather, Under the Library Dean/Director is Library Cabinet, which is composed of all team leaders. There are about 29 teams at the University of Arizona Library.

Flattening the organization empowers all levels of staff because they become part of the decision-making process, and therefore they become “stakeholders”—they have a stake in what happens (they “own” the process and product). Although there is some variance, each team seems to have its own mission, vision, and goals that reflect the overall mission, vision, and goals of the library as a whole. For example, the U of A’s mission is:

To promote life-long learning skills and continuous educational achievement, the University of Arizona Library is dedicated to meeting the diverse education and research needs of students, faculty, staff and other customers in an environment of free and open inquiry and with a commitment to excellence.

This overall mission is reflected in the Technical Services Team’s more specific mission:

We provide high-quality, accurate, and timely access to information resources by purchasing, licensing, cataloging, maintaining, and preserving those resources in all forms. We continue to listen to our customers and explore new processes and technologies in order to provide outstanding, cost-effective service. We participate in the investigation and identification of new technologies to assist us in connecting our customers to their information resources.

We work in a stimulating environment that inspires innovation and enthusiasm. We are flexible and are committed to adjusting to this environment with mutual respect and support.

2. Functional Teams

Each team sets its own goals, quality standards, and assessment; some like Technical Services Team have their own strategic plans. These teams regularly report to the entire library staff on progress, challenges, learnings, and revisions.

Within teams, there are sub-groups called “work teams”: For example, in the Technical Services Team, there are four work teams: Cataloging, Order/Physical Processing, Electronic Resources, and Receiving Work Teams. The Technical Services Team set quality standards for its respective areas. For example, one quality standard for Cataloging was to have 95 percent of all print materials delivered for shelving within one week of arrival in Technical Services. Currently, Cataloging is meeting this quality standard. Another example is from the Fine Arts & Humanities (FAH) Team. One of its quality standards is that 85 percent of General Education courses taught by FAH librarians will include an Information Literacy component.

Some Other Functional Teams are:

- Digital Library Initiatives
- Library Information Systems Team
- Special Collections
- Fine Arts/Humanities Team
- Social Sciences Team
- Science-Engineering Team
- Financial and Administrative Support Team
- Materials Access Team (Collection Maintenance/Circulation, Interlibrary Loan, Short-term Circulation, Materials Access Restructuring Transition Team)
- Technical Services Team
- Undergraduate Services Team

3. Cross-Functional Teams

Cross-Functional teams are formed when active participation is needed from more than one team. Each team has a specific project to work on, a charge, and they report on their progress, outcomes, and learnings.

For example, the Scholarly Communication Team was formed to address the problem that . . . “There is a lack of widespread knowledge and understanding of scholarly communication issues both within the library and within the campus community. Etc.” Members of the team were drawn from the Social Sciences Team, the Fine Arts and Humanities Team, and 5 others.

To address the stated problem, the team developed goals and specific tasks to implement them. For example, for the goal of educating library staff it set up three meetings on different issues of scholarly communication. For the goal of engaging the campus community, the U of A’s Attorneys Office presented a talk on “Managing Copyright in a Digital Environment,” and also arranged for informal meetings of faculty editors to discuss these issues.

*

Another cross-functional team is the Information Literacy Team made up of: Fine Arts and Humanities Team, Social Sciences Team, Science-Engineering Team, Undergraduate Services Team.

The previous year, they laid the groundwork for integrating IL into the General Education programs on campus.

Purpose/Charge of IL Team:

- The IL Team, with the Library, will work towards creating a coordinated campus-wide information literacy program based on the ACRL Standards for Higher Education.
- This program will work towards meeting the demonstrated needs of students and faculty at the University of Arizona.
- The IL Team will provide leadership and support to Integrated Services (public services) teams in this coordinated initiative.

The team identified the problems/issues, did a SWOT assessment (strengths, weaknesses (internal), opportunities, threats (external)).

This team developed 4 workshops to help librarians because it found it had to train its own staff to feel confident and competent to teach IL, and be advocates and experts of IL. So this year, they decided to focus on training.

They contacted the assessment office on campus to help do initial assessment of librarians, from which 4 workshops were developed by this Team:

1. What the Heck is Information Literacy?
2. How to Analyze Assignments for Information Literacy Content
3. Shazam! Ideas for Talking to Faculty about Assignments

4. Assessing Information Literacy at Multiple Levels

This Team also developed assessment tools that librarians could use.

Performance measures example: “The IL Team will provide at least 5 training activities during the 2001-2002 year.”

Some Other Cross-Functional Teams are:

- -Technical Planning Project Team
- -Virtual Reference Project Team
- -Scholarly Communication Project Team
- -Needs Assessment/Data Management Project Team
- -Reference Availability Project Team
- -Customer-Oriented Library Alignment Team
- -Strategic Long Range Planning Team
- -Information Resources Council
- -Information Commons Training Team

C. Other highlights

1. Information Commons: new construction, new area of library, ~300 computers with various researching and computing services, several help stations, over 20 group study rooms with glass doors/walls, reference book areas, lounge areas, instruction classroom, tables for laptop plugins.
2. Lots of documentation came out of the process, such as means of assessment for each goal. These means of measurement were consciously worked into each team’s charge and provided concrete measures of success.
3. In addition, because the library considers itself a learning organization, reading/learning/discussing library literature is an essential component of each team’s documents. Each team has a bibliography that it collected and refers to.

III. Highlights from Other Libraries

A. Brown University

Brown University has been involved in a planning process for two years. As a result of their strategic planning process, they decided that in order to work towards a more future-oriented vision of their library as an “extended classroom” it would be necessary to reorganize the library, move it away from its hierarchical communication and decision-making structure to a more flexible arrangement that would allow it to focus more on the future, work collaboratively, and reallocate staff and resources “to the vision.” Eventually, four “collaboratives,” were identified, each of which was to focus on a set of user-centered “core activities.” The collaboratives are Scholarly Resources, Learning and Curricular Resources, Access and Delivery, and Organizational Support. Each collaborative has a mission statement which is actually comprised of its core activities and their

associated outcomes. For example, the Learning and Curricular Resources Collaborative has “Orienting and Educating Users” as one of its 5 core activities. The outcome for this activity is: “As a result of this process, users—primarily undergraduates—develop their basic information literacy skills. . . .” The outcomes for all the activities listed are presented in this user-centered format.

The main part of the Brown presentation described a process, actually developed at the U of A, for developing user-centered activities. The process begins with an “As a result of this process, Library users will” statement, and then works backwards to define what specific “outputs” need to be created to achieve the user-centered goal, what “work activities” it would take to produce those outputs, and what “input” in the form of resources, expertise, collections, etc., are necessary before the actual work can begin.

B. University of Maryland

University of Maryland started reorganizing in 1996 when a new Library Dean was hired and several branch libraries and the Graduate Library merged with the Undergraduate Library. The library also received some new money for the restructuring. Task forces were formed to begin.

The library used John P. Kotter’s *Leading Change* (1995) on organizational transformation as one of the tools in this process, particularly his “Eight Steps for Successful Organizational Transformation.” It also used the consulting services of Maureen Sullivan at critical moments.

The presentation focused on “Speed Bumps” (problems) and “Green Lights” (achievements). Five speed bumps were identified: not doing enough sooner to prepare people for change; transition was too fast for some, too slow for others; need for (professional) facilitation support for new teams—Maureen Sullivan; need for clarification of role of leaders and administration; and the need for administration to balance hands on/off decision-making.

Some of the green lights were new programs that came out of the reorganization process, such as all-staff meetings or retreats with guest speakers and strategic planning; monthly Lunch with the Dean (of Libraries) occasions; monthly Journal Reading Group that discusses articles on change, teams, organizational development; a mentoring program for all levels of staff; among others.

The reorganization process helped the library establish a documentation of working papers, task force reports, assessment tools, etc. Many of these are on the website below.

The process also created two new positions: Assistant Dean for Organizational Development and coordinator of Personnel Programs.

C. Indiana University/Purdue University-Indianapolis (IUPUI).

David Lewis, the Library Dean, began his presentation by warning us that yooey poeey was no longer an acceptable way to refer to IUPUI.

Reorganization at IUPUI was a top-down process, necessitated by different expectations and decreased resources coming to the library from the University, as well as the need to take advantage of new technological developments. Lewis, referring to *The Innovator's Dilemma: When New Technologies Cause Great Firms to Fail* (2000) by Clayton M. Christensen, noted that there are two kinds of technology: sustaining technology can be accommodated by existing organization structure without too great an adjustment (e.g., an automated library system); disruptive technology undermines traditional organizations (e.g., digital libraries). In the business world, disruptive technologies are often developed by new organizations that are set up to exploit them. This is not possible in the library world, so we have to focus on change the organizational culture.

To accommodate the new situation, the then Dean moved from a hierarchical to a flattened, team-based structure. (This happened 5 years ago.) Lewis emphasized the need for a flattened structure to accommodate change and new work. The teams set up were client-focused and had overlapping assignments. There are required to meet together three times a year for up to a week to discuss their current situation and plans. The Birkman Assessment Method is used (see <http://www.eos.org/birkman.html>), and there is an emphasis made on developing local talent and leadership, especially among the technology staff.

Some other observations:

Librarians love to plan, but it may be more important to “conserve resources” and be opportunistic. Try out new things, don't be afraid of failure, try again.

It's more important to watch what users do than to do surveys and focus groups.

Too much emphasis on consensus can put a brake on necessary changes and adaptations. A culture of trust is important—trust those who are knowledgeable in certain areas to make the right decisions.

D. University of Connecticut

UConn also switched to a flat organizational (team approach) structure in 1996. To form the teams, volunteers were chosen by Leadership Council. Two examples of their teams are the Inforum team and the Web Publication Team. The goal of the Inforum team is to make sure that each library department becomes familiar with each other by observing and learning the day-to-day activities. To do this, they scheduled regular tours of all library areas for all staff, offered brown-bag lunches, and hosted various programs related to library events. The

Web Pub team is generally responsible for collecting content from library departments and posting it on the UConn webpage. In addition to members of this team who were chosen because of their knowledge of web design, two permanent members are the Webmaster and the head of Information Technology who act as a “check and balance” for the final product. Apparently this was necessary to prevent the Webmaster from being “too creatively ambitious.”

E. North Suburban Library System (NSLS) – Illinois

This is a consortium of over 650 libraries including public, school, academic, and special. It is one of 12 Illinois library systems funded by yearly grants from the Illinois General Assembly and the office of Jesse White, State Librarian.

Collectively, the libraries work to enhance the effectiveness of its members by facilitating and encouraging active cooperation and partnerships, offering education and life-long learning, provide advocacy for library services, increase public awareness of NSLS services and its member libraries. They create and present a monthly video “What’s New in Libraries” on their local cable TV channel. Also using the team approach, they regularly mix public relations personnel, reference librarians, and information technology people together to brainstorm about different projects. By using different personal mastery tools (contributed by Maureen Sullivan), they help members create new profiles, how to acquire new competencies, acknowledge different styles of learning, and learn how to function in a team setting.

IV. Pre-Conference Workshop

A. Goals and Objectives

The first section deals with comparing surveys with other options for gathering information about users and their needs. The “who, what, when, where, whys” are discussed.

B. Survey Design and Sampling

Preparation is of utmost importance in designing the survey. Content, usability, and survey size are three matters to be considered. Much time was spent on the process of sampling: determining sample size, how to avoid sample error, and how to reach optimal confidence intervals. UVA 2001 Student Survey was shown as an example.

C. Types of Survey Questions

Four types are attitudinal, behavior, knowledge, and demographic. Questions done correctly can produce valuable information while those done incorrectly can gather inappropriate data, introduce bias, or invalidate the survey. Other things to consider are whether to use open or closed questions, and nominal or qualitative vs. ordinal or ranking type questions.

D. Survey Administration

Topics in this section were responsibility for the survey, determining the survey schedule, preparing the survey, review and pilot testing, conducting the survey, and recording responses.

E. Data Analysis and Reports

Responses are evaluated, numbers are crunched and results are presented in the appropriate visual format (graph, chart, table, etc.)

F. Follow-up and Decisions

Results are publicized and possible actions are taken based on gathered responses.

V. Relevant Websites

University of Arizona Teams

<http://www.library.arizona.edu/library/teams/teams/html>

University of Arizona Organization Articles

<http://www.library.arizona.edu/library/teams/fast/biblio/html>

Brown University Library

http://www.brown.edu/Facilities/University_Library/MODEL

University of Maryland

<http://www.lib.umd.edu/PUB/inhousenews.html>

IUPUI

<http://www.ulib.iupui.edu/libinfo/teams.html>

University of Connecticut

<http://www.lib.uconn.edu/LivingTheFuture>

North Suburban Library System

<http://www.nsls.info>