Joint Meeting, Organizational Structure Committee and Strategic Initiatives Committee

MULN 486

Tuesday, June 14, 2011, 10:00am

Attending from SIC: Conway, Ganson, Jones

The two groups met to discuss the drafts of their plans to date. These minutes will cover the first half of the meeting only, the comments regarding the work of the Strategic Initiatives Committee (SIC).

The overall response was favorable. Individuals of the OSC noted that they could use the material from the SIC in their work.

One person noted that the final goal under the first initiative, “develop a database of ‘value’ statements,” matched the second goal under the fifth initiative. Another made the suggestion to retain the goal under the first initiative and delete the duplication.

In response to a question regarding the second goal under the second initiative, Ganson announced that the Libraries had adopted a digitization plan.

There was a question about the third goal under the first initiative, “develop . . . a central repository . . . pertaining to the accreditations and re-accreditations.” The SIC explained that although the academic departments may not wish to share these materials, input from the Libraries’ subject selector could be posted on the Web.

The OSC recommended that the SIC consider the role of retention under the fifth initiative, “enhance the learning of students.” The importance of mixing spaces for group and quiet, individual learning was mentioned.

There was a question regarding the heavy use of “repository” in the text. The SIC explained that the word had slightly different meanings in the various places. It was agreed that the SIC could re-examine the use of the word.

One person recommended defining “periodic” under the eighth initiative and using more specific timelines in other areas. The SIC responded that sufficient time had not been available to assign timelines for all goals.

There was considerable discussion about the fourth goal under the seventh initiative, “personnel from the Libraries attend training mandated by the University at the highest percentage of any group of employees.” It was observed that this feat would be difficult to document and that it might be better to make assignments in the statement of responsibilities and standards for employees across the Libraries.

The OSC inquired about the contours of Project SAILS. SIC responded that the standard program was straightforward and did not consist of a smorgasbord of elements.
The OSC inquired about the reason for selecting the target “three grants per year” under the third initiative—this goal might be too easy. Ganson noted that there were currently on average fewer than three successful grants per year. Another person noted that this question might indicate the need for a central location to house information about the Libraries and their grant activity.

The discussion proceeded to a review of the two models for reorganization presented by the OSC.

At the end of the meeting the OSC asked the SIC to consider if the current initiatives and goals as drafted addressed the organizational challenges that the two groups identified and discussed in the joint meeting.

Submitted by Phil Jones