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Background

As described in the Organizational Structure Committee Charge dated April 2011, “the amount of scholarly information being delivered in new ways grows daily. Librarians across North America are re-defining services, the delivery of information to scholars, and the roles of employees in that delivery process…. This committee is charged with scrutinizing the Libraries’ current organizational structure and workflows and developing organizational models that will support the reduction of redundancies and enhance organizational agility. As the charge mentions, “the strict lines of delineation marked out for the different kinds of work being done no longer make sense and are not working as effectively as in the past.” The Libraries must work harder to align our services with the mission and goals of the university, including providing easy access to research materials for scholars, putting the needs of students first, improving student retention and graduation rates, and enhancing diversity.

Process

The twelve committee members divided into two groups in order to develop the requested models.
The molecular model groups the large elements (branches, departments and the like) according to function. The model is relatively flat; broad task areas are represented by circles and the related functions gathered together. If it were three dimensional, the model would look more like a molecule or a DNA strand. Within the functional groups, the elements are not in hierarchy, but more coequal within the group. Leadership roles will be rotated among group members, with supervision and evaluation by team leaders and functional group leaders, and of those functional group leaders by director, associate dean or dean, as key parts of the Support Libraries group.

The groupings consolidate ‘like’ elements, so that people with similar skills and missions can cooperate and produce synergistic relationships between goals and services. The intention is to push tasks and how and when to do the work as close to the responsibility for the work as possible, giving employees more scope within their sphere and freeing team or unit leaders for greater involvement in other efforts.

The Outreach/Partnerships/Assessment group-- team leaders or members with relevant experience and/or training, would assist as the functional groups evaluate their work, support strategic planning, support innovation, and help vet future projects. They would plan and increase outreach, and seek and promote partnerships with relevant individuals, departments, peer libraries, and groups working on national initiatives. Membership in this group should be flexible and could rotate as necessary. Obvious cooperative partners would be the Help the Public group and Development, as one example of many possibilities.
Connecting with users implies energetic involvement of the Libraries with the campus in more personal and innovative ways and was the impetus for placing “Outreach/ Partnerships and Assessment” at the center of this model. The growing trend toward placing librarians in departments and colleges at least part of the time, mentioned by John Budd (2009) among others, is one of several ways to connect, and changing responsibilities for some more routine work is one way to create time for the librarians to be active in that role. This process requires thorough analysis. With the necessary training, putting responsibility for the smaller decisions ‘on the scene’ would increase responsive service.

The model allows for more flexibility, easier cooperation and quicker response to initiatives and emerging opportunities. Grouping by related functions puts ‘like with like’. Staff who understand a particular function in one circumstance will find it easier to ‘get’ and help with similar work in other circumstances; when work pace slows in one area, it may be faster in another, and people can move to the work as needed. Problems in common between libraries or parts of the libraries may be shared, and solutions developed in common.

Subgroup 2 Proposal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Discovery</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cataloging, Serials, Web Services, Systems, Digitization, Acquisitions, Preservation &amp; Binding</td>
<td>Reference, Branch Libraries, Special Collections, Performing Arts &amp; Media</td>
<td>Campus &amp; Desktop Delivery, Checkout/Check-in, Machinery Assistance, Reserves, Stacks &amp; Storage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subgroup 2 divided the work among four broad overlapping functions: Description, Discovery, Delivery, and Administration. This model advocates the continued use of a hierarchical structure, with modifications.

**Description:**

The work groups represented in the description function are largely responsible for making sure that library materials can be found, so their relationship to each other is natural and allows for complementary workflows to be grouped together. This increases efficiency and allows managers and supervisors to easily share related expertise.

**Discovery:**

The discovery function encompasses the traditional elements of reference, rebranded as Research Services, as well as the library branches, the Performing Arts and Media Department, and Special Collections and Archives. Activities should include ways to showcase the unique contributions the Libraries make to the campus environment. It will be necessary for people working on these projects to work in close cooperation with public relations staff. It is here that it will be possible to emphasize the delivery of individualized assistance as well as research skill
building as a critical component of academic success. By doing these things the Libraries can have a positive effect on retention and graduation rates (Bell, 2008).

Because Special Collections and Archives functions as a branch library, the subgroup recommends it be placed within the Discovery work group, in the interest of keeping “like” functions together as much as is pragmatically possible.

**Delivery:**
This department will be divided into two main units, Checkout Services and Materials Delivery. The Checkout Services work group will be responsible for all the everyday materials that circulate and will provide support for the microform machines and scanners. Reserves and Stacks management will function within Checkout Services.

The Materials Delivery Department will include interlibrary loan, patron-driven purchasing, desktop delivery, and physical retrieval and delivery. Of course, these functions will require close cooperation with staff in other areas such as acquisitions and cataloging. It may be desirable to assign an acquisitions staff person to the materials delivery work group in order to facilitate patron-driven purchasing projects.

The subgroup recommends the Periodicals service desk be closed. Because the staff currently working there is already assigned to Access Services, it will be possible to use their talents in the physical and desktop delivery group or in other areas that are identified in the near future.

**Library Administration:**
Library administrative functions should remain largely unchanged. The various units within this work group are administration, development, facilities management, human resources, and public relations. Because of the overarching nature of community outreach programs, that function should be managed and duties assigned by the Library Administration work group.

**Rationale:**
Subgroup 2 believes that there is no need to completely redesign the organizational structure; but that is not to say that no improvement is needed. By conducting a thorough workflow audit, we can re-prioritize work assignments, eliminate redundancy, and reorganize current work groups into an increasingly responsive and flexible organization.

**Conclusion**
Each of these models would work in this library system. One is flatter and somewhat organic in nature, and consolidates similar work, while the other maintains the hierarchical structure while creating new work groups and moving some assignments to different areas.