

Minutes
Joint Administration and Library Faculty Assembly
Committee on University Library Reorganization
Second Meeting, Friday, February 22, 2008, 11-12:30, Room 107, Marston

Roll of Members:

Stephanie Haas, Support Services, co-chair
James Cusick, Collections, co-chair
Carl Van Ness, Collections
Blake Landor, Collections
Jana Ronan, Public Services
Patrick Reakes, Public Services
Jimmie Lundgren, Technical Services
Priscilla Williams, Technical Services
Adrian Zeck, Collections
Jim Stevens, Public Services
Amy Polk, Support Services
Raimonda Margjoni, Technical Services

Brian Keith, ex officio

Observers: Joe Aufmuth, Vernon Kising

Meeting commenced 11:00 A.M.

Minutes were approved as amended.

A Reorganization Committee web site has been created courtesy of Tom Minton and is available to all at <http://www.uflib.ufl.edu/committees/reorganization> . Only members of the committee can add to the site, but it is available to all for read-only access. Currently, it contains comparisons of mission, vision, strategic goals, and organizational structures from the Benchmarking group. Minutes of the meetings will be added.

After the last meeting, the following three questions were circulated to all staff requesting their input:

- What are the current issues with the way the library is organized?
- What works well with our current organization and what does not work well?
- How could we reorganize to improve things at the library (communication, reporting structure, service, workloads, etc.)?

Input to the committee was summarized and organized by Jana Ronan. Additional responses were received by individual committee members. Note: in this instance and all others where anonymity is requested, committee members will summarize the input and share with the whole committee. It was noted that additional input should be expected from public services.

The committee reviewed existing comments. In particular members noted comments on the need for a structure that promotes communication, coordination of efforts, and accountability and that acknowledges the importance of science collections at UF. There seems a general consensus that collection management needs to be reevaluated as a department; Library West organization needs clarification; and there were a number of positive comments in favor of a center for emerging technologies.

One response indicated that while committees shouldn't be represented on the organization chart, coordination/communications mechanisms and structures need to be clarified during our discussions.

There was some lingering concern about the impact of the committee's efforts. Brian Keith clarified that he believes Judy's original organizational structure should be considered a starting point and that Judy has appeared to be receptive to suggestions to date. Joe indicated he could set up a conference call whenever the committee deemed it appropriate. It is likely that Judy will be asked to attend at least one of our meetings next week. Jim commented that the responsibilities of the committee were set forth in the charge: "to solicit and collect proposals and comments from faculty, staff, and administration; to analyze and synthesize organizational functions and structure; and, to make recommendations on reorganization to the Dean and the Chair of the Library Faculty Assembly." The committee decided to move ahead as charged. The Committee noted that a rationale was needed to accompany the final recommendation.

Discussion then moved on to an evaluation of the proposed organization charts created out of the dean's office and by Stephanie Haas and Betsy Simpson.

In a vote on structure, 10 members of the committee voted in favor of having an intermediary/deputy dean below the position of dean with the understanding that the head SUS Shared Facility and the associate dean of development would report directly to the dean and that all other divisions/division heads would report through the intermediary dean. There were 2 opposing votes.

Discussion proceeded about a reporting structure for West, Marston, and the branches, with no decision reached. Committee members debated the merits of having a rotating chair for the branches who reports directly to a deputy dean or a system where all the heads of the branches report individually—either to a deputy dean or an associate dean of collections. This matter is still open for discussion. The suggestion was made to look at the organizational structures that are now on the web site. Stephanie also suggested looking at the University of Maryland which has a complex chart, but which uses a team approach for internal organization.

There was a general opinion that putting technical/digital services in the same division with HR, Business services, and Facilities was putting too many diverse components under one associate dean; and that it would be difficult to locate an associate dean with the experience to oversee all these units.

The committee asked Stephanie to contact the dean concerning the following questions:

Regarding the need for the Sr. Associate Dean position in her proposed structure:

What are the dean's externally focused duties and responsibilities including development and fund-raising and what is the percentage of her time that will be dedicated to them?

What is the dean's thinking/rationale for the need for an intermediary dean (called a sr. assoc. dean in her original reorganization chart)?

Where does Access Services fit in the proposed reorganization?

The meeting was adjourned at 12:30 PM

The next meeting will be held, Monday, February 25 from 9:30 to 11:00 in Room 1A Library East.