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Executive Summary

Dean of Library Services Christopher Cox established this Task Force in March of 2014 in order to begin the process of changing the organizational structure of the library. The purpose of the Task Force was stated as “To identify an organizational structure which best meets our mission and helps us best achieve it.” The Task Force charge is included in this report as Appendix A. An additional document titled “Keys to the Kingdom” was provided to the Task Force to provide focus and it is included in this report as Appendix B.

The Task Force was charged with presenting Dean Cox with three to five possible organization charts. As the group completed research and reviewed other libraries’ charts we came to the conclusion that we were not equipped nor being asked to reorganize the library down to the position level. It was important for us to have an understanding of the main identifiable functions that are present in the current departments and consider if their present departments were the best location given the goals of the Task Force. Thus all the Task Forces’ work focused on the top level of our organization, at the departmental level, and with specific job functions. The Task Force does not claim to have every job function represented but the majority of the main functions are present.

This report discusses the activities and conclusions of the Task Force and presents 3 different organizational charts as possible new organizational structures for the library. It should be noted that the Task Force chose to use pie charts as the means of representing organization structure. The following charts represent the broad divisions of the final charts presented and discussed in this report.
Overview

Rod Library is currently organized into five departments and the Dean’s Office. The departments include Reference and Instructional Services, Collection Management and Special Services, Technical Services, Access Services, and Library Information Technologies. This organization has been in place almost in its entirety since around 2004 when the Acquisitions and Cataloging departments merged to form Technical Services. All departments except Access Services are led by an administrative faculty member. The Access Services Department is coordinated by a Professional and Scientific staff member. All department heads and the Access Services Coordinator report to the Dean, as do three Dean’s Office staff members.

Part of the Task Force’s charge was to consider positions that the Library sees as a need in the future and also to build in flexibility to allow us to add new positions as new initiatives or trends arise in the library field. Currently some important and time consuming duties are being completed by standing committees. These committees could potentially be replaced by new staff in the future.

- Public Relations Committee handles marketing and public relations efforts;
- Assessment Task Force is working to initiate, promote and support assessment efforts;
- Employee Development Committee leads and promotes professional development activities for faculty and staff;
- Diversity Task Force works to promote and foster diversity in staffing, services, and collections; and
- Learning Commons Task Force is providing the initial vision, development, and structure of the Library’s Learning Commons.
Goals for reorganization

During the course of meetings the committee worked with Chris Cox to establish the following goals.

Create an organizational structure that:

- Aligns library organization structure with the library's role in campus strategic priorities.
- Effectively merges the Museum unit and provides flexibility to incorporate future new positions as the needs arise.
- Promotes synergies between work with similar functions to improve the flow of work processes and communication.
- Promotes transparency and the free flow of ideas and information among everyone in the organization.
- Enables the Dean of Library Services to focus on external objectives and strategic directions, such as fund-raising and promoting campus awareness of Library services.

Data collection methodology/activities

Summary of Activities
The Task Force met for the first time on March 31, 2014. Our first task was to plan a presentation to be given at the library wide meeting on April 10th about our goals and plan of action to achieve them. The Task Force met weekly after its first meeting with few exceptions.

The Task Force began gathering input after the library wide meetings by utilizing a group discussion technique called “Circle of Voices”. This activity happened within the various employee groups—faculty, professional & scientific, and merit. The input that was gathered is reported on the Task Force website, and was used to update the library SCOT analysis.

The Task Force also collected input from individuals in the library using a survey hosted on Survey Monkey. The survey was taken by the majority of employees in the library.

The Task Force held open forums to discuss the following questions:
- Why reorganize? Why reorganize now?
- Committees! HUH!..yeah!.. What are they go-od for...
- Where does digitization belong in the Library?
- Learning Commons: How does the conversion of the library's main floor impact reorganization?
- What emerging trends impact reorganization?
- A Proposal to consider: “Ideas for Consideration Regarding Reorganization of the Rod Library” - by Tom Kessler”

Input was solicited by various other means, such as opening the first ten minutes of each meeting for staff to drop in and discuss their thoughts, opportunities to meet one-on-one with the group, and an anonymous link was added to the Task Force’s web page on RodNet.

The Task Force met for a ½ day retreat in July to make initial organization drawings. This was a very productive meeting and produced our first reorganization charts. The task force presented refined versions of its initial drawings at the library wide retreat on August 21st. One and one-half hours of this library wide retreat were dedicated to activities surrounding reorganization. A lot of good feedback was obtained and incorporated into the next round of drawings in September and October.
After our second round of drawings, the taskforce met with each department to gather feedback as to how the reorganization incorporated in each chart might positively or negatively impact current workflows of the existing department. The committee used this feedback to develop three final charts.

**Staff Feedback**

Staff tended to comment on what they did not like about the pie charts rather than what they approved of. In most cases we have support for opposite placement of different pieces of the pie. There was rarely any consensus in the comments.

Generally almost no comments were made on the Administration or Library Operations slice. Small changes were suggested only, including having mail report to Access or Collection Services rather than Administration. It was thought by some that since the majority of the mail are library materials and Interlibrary Loan items that it would make more sense there instead of in Administration. However others thought that it did not make a difference who sorted and distributed the mail, since it could be that all staff will be on the first floor eventually. Mail would not necessarily need to be distributed by Technical Services staff.

The main areas that were questioned included collection development, whether it should remain paired with the special services units or merged with other collection activities, what should be included in a Learning and Research Services slice, and should patron type services and related functions be in their own Access Services slice or merged with another area.

Some felt that Learning and Research Services should not include patron services. They felt that it was more logical to keep them separate since one involved learning activities and the other outward service activities. Others felt the two areas supported each other and had similar goals so it made sense to have them in one slice.

Another area of concern was the assignment of the special services units. Do they belong with collection management activities or somewhere else? There was some support for the merging of Youth and FPAC with a Learning and Research Services slice since they provide similar services as our current reference department, although with a circulation aspect right now. Some also believe that Special Collections and Museums should also be included in that slice as they also provide research services. Others, including some staff in those units, believe they should be in a separate slice by themselves. Others suggested leaving them with collection management activities. Comments from Collection Management and Special Services departmental meetings showed the staff felt strongly about not being in their own slice any longer but to be merged with a slice providing similar services. This merger will enhance communication and reduce silos.

Views on digitization activities are also split. Some believe they should be included with the pie slice that has other specialized collections. Others believe it should be its own slice so that they would receive the support and resources they need to grow. More noted the need for their own slice to allow them to grow however. Some comments on earlier pie chart versions were that having digitization and IR in their own slice recognizes the trends in this area and puts appropriate emphasis on these activities.

There is general concern among staff about what the departments would look like at the next level. Some noted concerns that the structure will not be flexible enough if we have a hierarchical structure in each department. Developing the departments at the next level should be considered carefully to build in flexibility to include new initiatives and to not inhibit communication. The reporting structure needs to be thoughtfully developed and implemented with significant input from the library faculty and staff. Some are concerned that the number of slices would equal the number of people sitting on an administrative council.

The following are some comments taken directly from RodNet grouped by specific focus areas of interest. Please note that not all comments are included here.
Special Units Location:

- “I do not think that Special Collections, Archives, Museums, and Digital Initiatives should be in a separate slice of the pie. This segregation does not promote the integration of these units and activities with other Library resources or their full use and appreciation by Library patrons.”
- “The Special Collections pieces seem to fit well.”
- “I like the fact that there is a slice for Special Collections, Museums, and IR....just thinking perhaps that catagory should be broader by Labeling it Unique Collections and adding Youth and FPAC, since these are not part of the general collection either.”
- “Youth, FPAC and Gov Docs instruction and teaching makes sense together under the Learning & Research Services pie chart”
- “The Museums and Special Collections and the IR should not be separated out, but continue to reside with Collection Management as these are very specialized materials and do not fit well with any other pie slice. So instead of five slices you would end up with four slices, with Collection Management combined with Special Collections, Archives, Museums, and Digital Initiatives since these all deal with management of collections.”
- “The FPAC and Youth are very similar to what other libraries have and are not unique in themselves. They also do instruction and teaching so it would be more beneficial to have these two areas tied to the Learning & Research Services so they can take advantage of more staff to assist in these sessions and vice versus”
- “I do not care for the way in which collections and services are organized in this chart. I do not think that Digital Initiatives or what is termed the Special Units should be placed in separate pieces of the pie.”
- “Just throwing this out there.....do the special areas (FPAC, Spec Coll, Museums, Youth) have to have a separate designation or can they be lumped into another category (like Collections)?”
- “I was surprised to see Docs, CIEP, Browsing, Newspapers under Public Services. To me, they are collections and should either go into Special Units or Collections Services.”
- “Learning Services - IR should be in collections, as should the variuos specific collections like Youth, Career, Periodicals, etc.”

Administration:

- “Mail: Mail should not be under the Administration slice. Almost all of our mail is Interlibrary Loan packages and book orders. Very little is actual "letters and envelopes". All of our mail is brought in through the loading dock (when it's open) and it is exactly where it should be in Acquisitions. ILL and Order Receiving is only a few steps away from the mailroom!”
- “Mail is a library-wide service, although much of what is received is probably ILL packages. The relationship to where Technical Services and ILL are presently located may be a moot point if some areas are moved to the first floor. Technical Services may not be located by the loading dock in the future, so the Mail function may not follow Technical Services, and may need to remain on the second floor close to the loading dock.”

Learning and Research Services:

- “Just because the Digital Media Hub is located in the Learning Commons, does not mean it should be reporting or fall under the Learning & Research Services pie slice, unless LIT has oversight. That area needs students trained extensively in the technology used in that area, which I believe should fall under our LIT, wherever they might end up. The MC's should also report to LIT. And unless we have many staff who are specifically trained in the technology that will be used in the new Makerspace, I believe that should fall under LIT also, for that reason again.”
- “wonder about some things being placed in learning & research slice, like circ for example. I see that more in collection or support slices than learning & research.”

Digitization:
• “I think that collection development and digitization activities should be in the same slice of the pie as specialized collections, such as Archives and the Museum.”
• “I like this chart but it may be good to break out Digital Initiatives as in Chart C to make it more likely such activities will get needed support”.
• “I like the separate Digital Initiatives group because I'm guessing this will result in more resources. However, the aspects like servers and desktop support all other groups.”
• “I like the designation of anything digital as its own category. It seems like a natural grouping”.
• “It seems very natural to put digital collections, programming, and web development in the same department for instance”
• “Learning Services - IR should be in collections, as should the various specific collections like Youth, Career, Periodicals, etc”.

Final Charts

The final charts presented here are the synthesis of ideas generated by feedback gathered on the website, in departmental meetings, in open forums, and in ongoing conversations and email exchanges that took place amongst library staff and the task force members. The charts are named according to the number of high level divisions contained in the chart. Full page copies of each chart are found in the Appendix.

The Task Force recommends that these charts be evaluated first and foremost at the high level divisions. Individual functions or units can easily be transferred among these divisions as part of a refinement process.

The Task Force has been asked on more than one occasion if we prefer as specific chart, but the Task Force as a whole is not inclined to recommend a single organizational pie chart from the three we present in this report. There are related functions within each chart that seemed to logically fit better as presented. There may be individual slices from each that may work well when combined in other ways. We understand that Dean Cox may or may not select one of the three as his preferred chart, or he may select portions from each chart to form a new chart. He may also reject all three and utilize the feedback that was received to build a completely new chart. Given this, the Task Force felt the reorganization process and staff engagement was just as important as the end results.

Here are a few relevant points about each chart worth noting.

Org Chart 3:
• One concern with this chart is the potential size of the Learning and Research Services slice. Since this slice includes activities relating to reference, research, instruction, some access services, and all actual collections, the majority of our staff could potentially be employed in this slice. A reoccurring question is how the department would manage all these activities and what would the structure look like.
• With fewer departments some felt this chart would be the most flexible. It would be easier to stop doing certain functions and begin new functions with fewer administrators involved in the approval process.
• Someone suggested that instead of 3 departments we could have 3 teams, with a team leader for each one. There was concern too that if there were 3 department heads that they would have too much responsibility.
• This one would break down some of the current silos we have now.
Org Chart 4:
- This chart originally had five divisions. One of those divisions contained only the special units Fine and Performing Arts Collection, Youth Collection, Special Collections, and the Museum. It was communicated that this type of Silo was not desirable in a future organization structure. The committee decided to move the units in this slice over to Learning and Research Services rather than to Collection Services.

Org Chart 5:
- The digitization activities and IR were moved from the Technology Services slice to the Collection Services slice. Some commented that these activities belong with collection development activities. Others commented that all digitization belongs in its own slice.
- There was general approval to separate access type services from learning related services and activities. When they were paired together some staff commented that it made more sense for them to be in different slices, or pair access with collections rather than a learning slice.
Organization Chart: Three

Chart Three features three major divisions, maximizing the combination of complementary functions. Collection Services combines all of the functions that acquire, maintain, and provide basic access to all of the library’s information and resources, from the acquisition of electronic and physical resources to the creation of local resources, along with the systems that allow library patrons to both locate and utilize those resources. Learning & Research Services helps and educates library users in making the best use of the library’s collections and resources, including all reference and instruction services, as well as the circulation of physical resources and the provision to users of equipment, and facilities. Finally, Support Services provides support for all aspects of library operations and personnel, broadly encompassing functions from fundraising and public relations, to planning and assessment, and to human resource service and staff development. The small number of divisions in this chart raised the question with many about what further sub-organization might be needed.

Org Chart: Three

Collection Services: Acquire, maintain, and provide basic access to the library’s collection
Learning & Research Services: Helping & educating library patrons in making the best use of collections
Support Services: Providing support for all aspects of library operations & personnel

11/5/14
Organization Chart: Four

Chart Four shares some similarities with Chart Three, with an additional division and some important differences. Its Collection Services combines all of the functions that acquire and maintain all of the library’s information and resources. Learning & Research Services helps and educates library users in making the best use of the library’s collections and resources, including all reference and instruction services, as well as the circulation of physical resources and the provision to users of equipment, and facilities. It also features a Library Operations division that shares some things in common with Chart Three’s Support Services. This chart, however, breaks out Digital Services into its own division, combining many technology-related functions, including the creation and organization of local digital resources, web development, desktop computer support, and basic access to all of the library’s information and resources.

Assessment, cash register/coin control/deposits, development, diversity, event coordination, exhibits, external relations, facilities, fundraising, general budget/financial, human resources, moving/furniture assembly, patron billing/fines, planning, plants, public relations, staff development, strategic planning oversight, supplies, travel

Browsing Collection, Career Collection, Center for the Book, CIEP/ESL Collection, circulation, copyright, Digital Media Hub, disability services/assistive technology, distance education, educational technology, equipment check-out, Fine & Performing Arts Collection, friends groups

Government Documents & Maps Collection, Information service/directional, instruction, Interlibrary Loan, Learning Commons, Makerspace, Media Consultants, Microforms Collection, Museum, Newspaper Collection, outreach, Periodicals Collection, Reference Collection, research consultations, Reserve Collection, room scheduling, Rural School Papers, service points, Special Collections & Archives, stacks maintenance/shelving, study rooms, Video & DVD Collection, Youth Collection

BEPReSS/IR, cataloging (digital metadata), ContentDM, database maintenance, desktop support, digital scholarship, digitization (scanning), servers, software development, systems support, (EDS, ILS, etc.), web development

Acquisition, authority control, binding, campus liaisons, cataloging (marc records), collection inventories, consortium, gifts, Government Documents receiving/processing, licensing, materials budget, mail, order/receive/claim, physical processing, select/deselect, serials, usage statistics/analysis, vendor/publisher correspondence, vendor troubleshooting, video streaming

11/5/14
Organization Chart: Five

Chart Five goes another step further than Chart Four, adding another division and other important distinctions. Its Collection Services combines all of the functions that acquire and maintain all of the library’s information and resources. Learning & Research Services helps and educates library users in making the best use of the library’s collections and resources, including all reference and instruction services. Its Administration division closely matches Chart Four’s Library Operations. In Chart Five, however, Technology Services not only encompasses Digital Services from Chart Four, but also all of the services and equipment of the Digital Media Hub. In addition, Access Services is broken out into a separate division and includes the provision of services such as circulation, equipment checkout, and room scheduling. One observation from library personnel about Chart Five is that it matches current library structure more closely than any of the others.
Conclusion

As the Task Force worked to gather feedback from library faculty and staff certain issues were brought to us that we feel cannot be addressed by reorganization alone. Reorganization may be a step toward alleviating the issues but will not solve the issues. For instance, a small number of faculty and staff indicated they were concerned that the number of departments would represent the number of seats at the Library Administrators Council. They felt that 3 or even 5 may be too few “seats at the table”. Currently all five departments are represented on the Council by the department head or coordinator. The Task Force attempted to assure these individuals that although it was a valid concern this group could not speak to the future make-up of the Administrators Council. That was a topic for Dean Cox to consider as he develops the new organizational structure. Due to the concerns shared the Task Force recommends that Dean Cox consider making changes to the administrative council to include more voices.

Another concern that reoccurred frequently was that of transparency and communication in general. Part of our goals is to present charts that encourage communication and support transparency and the free flow of ideas. We feel we have accomplished this goal in recommending an organization of functions that would improve or support communication based on the proximity of the responsibilities in the various departments. However, we are still an organization of people and where there are people working together, communication problems will develop. We each have our work and personality styles that will not change by restructuring the organization. Our organization needs to continuously support initiatives to help each of us improve our communication styles and in general how we work with others. Transparency was also mentioned frequently. Dean Cox has made many advances in being a more transparent organization but the Task Force was still struck by the lack of trust within the organization. This lack of trust also cannot be fixed through reorganization. It must be rebuilt by all the individuals in the organization.

The Task Force Web Site contains additional information and includes earlier versions of charts with feedback which may be of interest as part of the history of the final charts. The web site can be viewed at https://rodnet.lib.uni.edu/committees/rtf
Appendix A
Task Force Charge

Purpose

- To identify an organizational structure which best meets our mission and helps us best achieve it.

Principles

- Vision will be for 5-10 years out. As a result, it may include departments that have not been created or positions not yet filled.
- Involvement of entire staff and their input is essential to success.
- Staff members are encouraged to keep an open mind and explore different permutations.
- Organizational changes will be made to solve problems and create solutions, as well respond to current and future needs.
- No one will lose their job as part of this process! However, job duties may change based on discussions and needs, and reporting or department affiliation may change.
- Dean will make final call as to new organizational structure, hoping for consensus developing around a particular approach.

Process

- Reorganization Task Force to be formed consisting of five people representing various departments and employee types. Representation from Strategic Planning Committee, Employee Development Committee may be beneficial. Dean may serve ex officio.
- Task force will conduct external scan trends in academic libraries, noting areas of collection and service which are diminishing and those that are growing and new areas libraries are moving into.
- Task force will also review current Rod Library Strategic Plan and UNI Strategic Plan, departmental goals and objectives, Rod Library Building Feasibility Study, and any other documents which may assist.
- Task force will present results of external scan to library staff and lead library-wide discussions regarding the results of this external scan.
- Discussions could take place in departments or in designated small groups consisting of members from various different library departments to discuss options.
- Task force will update library SWOT analysis as part of internal scan to make sure current organizational strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats are documents and share results with library staff.
- Task force will examine organizational charts of libraries at peer institutions, aspirational institutions, UI and ISU, and any others the Task Force deems appropriate. This may also involve looking at different organizational structures (web, teams, clusters, etc.)
- Task force will propose 3-5 potential organization charts to staff and Dean for comment. Dean will choose from these or develop alternatives incorporating some of the ideas from these charts.

Proposed Timeline (Fluid – could change after meetings with Task Force)

- Week of March 10 – Task Force members selected. (Volunteer call out 3/7/14)
- Week of March 24 – Task Force begins their work on external scan and update of SWOT
- April 10 - Update on activities and findings thus far and announcement of discussion groups at All Library Meetings
- Week of April 21 – External scan and SWOT completed. Begin collection/review of org charts
• Week of May 5 – Engage staff in org chart exploration
• May 30 – Example org charts to Dean and staff for review and comment – All Staff Meeting?
• Week of June 2 – Dean meeting with Task Force
• Week of June 9 – Possible announcement of new org structure and chart.
• Could interface with Library Staff Retreat in August depending on actual time needed to complete the process and engage staff.

Committee Membership
• John Wynstra (Chair); Cynthia Bancroft; Susan Basye; Gretchen Gould; Jeanne Little; Linda McLaury; Clint Wrede
Appendix B
Keys to the Kingdom

Keys to the Kingdom – Ideas and Advice for Rod Library Reorganization

Key Reorganization Questions

- What new positions do we have need of?
- What are our growth areas?
- What new services do you see coming forward in the library?
- How will they be staffed as demand increases?
- What services or work do you see going away?
- What committee work may be best completed by a position?
- How are the UNI Museums best integrated into the organization?
- Where do new initiatives such as digitization belong in the org chart?
- What challenges does the organization face (i.e. communication) that could influence the organizational structure?

Essential Projects to Inform the Process

- Meet with each department to get their take on the work they do and how it may be changing.
- Create a RodNet presence with documents and minutes posted so there transparency during the process.
- Have an anonymous comment area for library staff to provide feedback during the process.
- Set up workgroups around certain key questions to get library staff thinking not only outside their comfort zone, but outside their own departments.
- Explore the literature of trends in academic libraries and prediction of the future.
- Examine organizational charts of other libraries – peer, libraries we aspire to become.
- Are there different job titles or department names which we should be using instead of what is currently used, to align with trends in libraries or to clarify for users what we do?
- Explore current job lists to determine what new positions are being advertised for.

Essential Documents to Review

- UNI Strategic Plan
- Rod Library Strategic
- PlanSWOT Analysis - 11/7/2102 (will need to be updated)
- Personnel Needs Brainstorm – 2/19/2014
- Rod Library Building Feasibility Study
- Collection Management Plan (in process by Bibliographers)
- "Redefining the Academic Library: Managing the Migration to Digital Information Services." The Advisory Board Company, 2011.
Appendix D

Org Chart: Three
Appendix F
Org Chart: Five

[Diagram of an org chart with various sections such as Access Services, Administration Services, Technology Services, Learning & Research Services, and Collection Services. Each section contains subcategories related to the functions of the organization.]